This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

324.3 S77
The woman movemen
Schlesinger Library
3 2044 087

324.3 S77
The woman movement in America;
Schlesinger Library
001809363
3 2044 087 355 558

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY
Schlesinger Library
WOMAN'S ARCHIVES
From the library of
Alice Stone Blackwell

75 cts

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

Susan B. Anthony

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

A SHORT ACCOUNT
OF THE
STRUGGLE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

BY

BELLE SQUIRE

WITH PORTRAITS

CHICAGO
A. C. McCLURG & CO.
1911

COPYRIGHT
A. C. McCLURG & CO.
1911

Published November, 1911

Entered at Stationers' Hall, London, England.

324.3
S77²

PRESS OF THE VAIL COMPANY
COSHOCTON, U. S. A.

PREFACE

WITH the hope that it will explain briefly the meaning of the Woman Suffrage Movement, this little book is offered. It is meant for the busy reader, who has not time for more than a short account of the struggle of women for political freedom, and in no wise is it meant as a critical study, but rather as a brief story of an interesting and vital phase of history.

The first six chapters were written originally for *The Chicago Sunday Tribune* as an introduction to the story of Suffrage Movement in Illinois. It had fallen to my lot to present the cause of the suffragists of my State and I saw no better way to begin the work than by showing the relation of the various suffrage clubs and suffrage activities of the present to the struggles of the past for liberty. The story of the Suffrage Movement was itself new to me when I began to

write it; it was written somewhat hastily in newspaper style, for newspaper readers. When it was decided to enlarge these newspaper articles into a small book it seemed best to write the succeeding chapters in the same style in which the original ones were written.

Each chapter, therefore, commences with a dramatic incident, for I have endeavored to present history, not in the usual chronological order, but in a series of word pictures, sufficiently dramatic to arrest and hold the attention, leaving the reader with an array of pictorial impressions rather than a collection of facts. I have hoped, too, by this method, to interest the boys and girls of the nation in this, perhaps the greatest of all movements the world has ever seen. If then by means of what I have here hastily and imperfectly written there will be a better understanding of the meaning of "Votes for Women" in the widest and most comprehensive sense, my mission will have been accomplished.

BELLE SQUIRE.

CHICAGO,
August, 1911.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Concerning the Doctrine of "the Natural Inferiority of Woman"	1
II	The First Heroines of a New World	28
III	Women of the Revolution: They Shared the Cost but not the Gain of the Great Struggle	45
IV	Beginning of the Woman's Rights Movement	64
V	Susan B. Anthony Becomes Leader of Woman's Rights Movement	79
VI	The Effect of the Civil War and the Constitutional Amendments	92
VII	The Women Give Up Their Cause to Further that of the Slave	114
VIII	The Woman's War Begins Again: Years 1865–68	127
IX	The Greatest of Political Crimes	151
X	The Woman Movement Invades the National Capital: Years 1869–70	161
XI	Victoria Woodhull Invades the Woman Movement	172
XII	The Movement Gets Into the Civil and Criminal Courts	194
XIII	"The Whirlwind of the Lord" and What Came of It	216

CHAPTER PAGE

XIV The Movement Finds Champions in the Senate 232

XV One Reason Why the Movement Languished 246

XVI The Awakening 253

XVII Counting the Gains 261

XVIII Into the New Century 270

XIX Looking Into the Future 281

LIST OF PORTRAITS

	PAGE
Susan B. Anthony	*Frontispiece*
Mary Wollstonecraft	12
Anne Hutchinson	30
Lucretia Mott	66
Frances Wright	70
Elizabeth Cady Stanton	82
Anna E. Dickinson	102
Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell	108
Lucy Stone	136
Matilda Joslyn Gage	164
Mrs. John Biddulph Martin, formerly Victoria Claflin Woodhull	174
Frances Willard	218
Belva A. Lockwood	242

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT

CHAPTER I

CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF "THE NATURAL INFERIORITY OF WOMAN"

DISGUISE it as you may, hide it under whatever high-sounding titles you will,—"chivalry," "expediency," "the order of nature,"—the fact remains that at the bottom of the political, civil, and industrial disability of woman, and the whole opposition to grant her justice in this regard, lies the stubborn idea of her "natural inferiority" to man, and his consequent dominion over her. "Because she is a woman" is the sum and substance of all the arguments against her claiming complete equality with the other half of the race to which she undoubtedly belongs, although even this has

been disputed at times; for man in his overweening conceit has been guilty, in the past, of claiming that he, the male, was the race itself; woman, the female, being only the medium by which males were reproduced!

It was perhaps in the transient nature of things, or things as they seemed to be during the upward struggle of the race, that the idea of woman's natural inferiority sprang. It was perhaps inevitable; for, ignorant of the true function of sex, ignorant of the real meaning of such differentiation in the great moral design, which is only now beginning to be unrolled before our conscious eyes, man, the strong, restive, free, has by turns subjugated or fallen captive before woman, the weaker, the more passive, the natural captive of nature itself.

He did not know, in that early day, that sex was the concomitant of all life on this globe of ours, pervading even the lowliest forms of plant and animal life; that without sex there could be no progress, no development. He had forgotten, if indeed he ever knew or realized it, the part that woman had played in the ages far behind them, that he

had indeed usurped her superiority, claiming her inventions as his own, not understanding that she was the mother of industry, the mother of civilization, the great conservator of life and progress, the mother of humanity itself, without whose aid man never could have compassed human form nor generated human love, nor could he ever have known God, whatever God may be.

Ignorant, too, of the meaning of the bond by which he was bound to her; despising, glorifying, bewailing, belittling, or ridiculing the strength of the weakness which drew him to her, he has despised her, maltreated her, enslaved her, loved her, fled from her, hated her, cherished and sometimes worshipped her; and, in his supreme egoism, in the all-sufficiency of his own rights and his own reasoning, he conceived in the early days the idea that she was created expressly for him, for his use, his comfort, by an all-wise and beneficent God!

His other ideas, conceived at the same time, he has had to give up, for it has been proved, beyond even the shadow of a doubt, that the sun, moon, and stars were not

created for his especial benefit, and as a matter of fact do not even belong to him, existing apparently in and for themselves and the great system to which they belong, of which his world, so vast to his untutored eyes, is but a tiny, insignificant part, a grain of sand among the bowlders of the universe. As for his natural lordship over this world of ours, he has had to contend for every inch of it against nature herself, who, for the stubbornness with which she holds to her own convictions, might be suspected of belonging to the other sex.

Just when the idea of "woman's natural inferiority" was born, is hard to say. It became a lusty brood, however, and like other pests, its chief concern has ever been the propagation of its species.

From the laws which have been enacted from time to time since history began, one would suspect that the chief concern of man, Church and State, has been to bolster up by force of some kind, civil, religious, or brute, his early conception of man's inherent and natural superiority to woman.

With the progress of civilization, and in spite of woman's natural advance as a rational creature along with him, man has clung tenaciously to his ancient idea of his own inherent superiority. Perhaps it was in the nature of things, or in the order of nature, that he usurped all sorts of authority, domestic, political, ecclesiastical, moral, and civil. In his superb conceit he designated the Creator of the universe as "Father," and limited the Great Unknown to his own sex [1] alone.

In his struggle to maintain his vaunted superiority, man has not been entirely logical in his reasoning. The Mosaic story of creation makes man — meaning male and female — the last product of the Creator, vegetation, fishes, birds, mammals, sun, moon, and stars preceding the advent of human creatures. Being made in the likeness of God, they were given, so the story runs, dominion over the earth and its hum-

[1] The Hebrew name Jehovah is said to have been originally a double-sexed word, meaning "father-mother."

bler inhabitants; but the Mosaic account is conflicting and contradictory; all of which man and the theologians have turned to selfish account.

By authority of the first chapter of Genesis, man claims dominion and consequent superiority over the whole earth and its inhabitants because his kind, male and female, was made last and made in the image of the Creator; yet by virtue of the second chapter, man claims superiority to woman because he was created first! He is superior to the animal and vegetable worlds because his kind crowned the previous creation of their kinds; the world and its inhabitants belong to him because they were created first. Yet he claims a superiority to the woman because she was an afterthought, at least so the story goes, and therefore was created for him, not he for her!

Man is indeed supreme, according to this reasoning. All that went before him belongs to him because it went before him; all that comes after belongs to him because it comes after. For him all things were made, without a doubt! He is the supreme and natural

ruler of the world, to question which were rankest heresy. As for woman, she should be content, as all "good" women have been, thus to be the companion of this favored of the gods, content to be at his continual service, to please him, cheer him, help him; for she exists not for herself, but for his comfort, his well-being, and his pleasure!

Such has been the burden of thought which has crushed woman and stultified her throughout the centuries, especially the ages dominated by Christian thought. In the main, with but few exceptions, she was denied the right to think; but so, too, was man. In many insidious ways, however, she was especially discouraged from mental action, and had been from the earliest times,[1] Christian as well as pagan. For ages she was denied an education, except the most rudimentary, because it was not thought necessary for her to have one. It was not until the nineteenth century that it was even conceded by a few that she had a

[1] See I Cor. xiv, 34; I Tim. II, 11, 12, 15; Eph. v, 23, 24.

right to an education, a right that was fought for as strenuously, and denied as emphatically, as her right to the ballot is in this. Strangely enough, the arguments used against granting woman the ballot are the very same ones used formerly against her having an education.

In the course of century upon century, society advanced from the simple community life of primitive times, and went through the various stages of gens, tribe, and nation. Governments were instituted. Society grew complex. The past grew mighty, and tradition ruled. That which had been was right, because it had existed of old. Priestcraft developed and wove a web of fantasy, precept, and morality into the lives of men and women, enchaining the minds of all with superstitious fear. Kings came into power and grew tyrannical. Whole peoples were often but the pawns of crafty, selfish rulers; and the earth was drenched in blood to avenge a fancied insult, or to further the personal ambition of some mighty sovereign, who traced his ancestry back to heaven it-

self, and claimed to rule over his people by right divine, even as man ruled over woman by the same high authority.

Classes grew and multiplied, those who were above claiming also divine commission for their power, and ever demanding submission from those beneath. There were many grades of superiors and many grades of inferiors, but at the lowest depth was woman; for no man so low, no matter how mean a slave, but that some woman was lower still, a slave's slave, in very deed and truth.

Thus civilization, the outward semblance of it, with all its wealth and power, its cruelty and oppression, its growing, leavening thought, moved slowly on and expressed itself in a multitude of ways: — tribe, nation, empire; chieftain, king, emperor; democracy, aristocracy, republic; freeman, master, slave; lord, serf; monogamy, polyandry, polygamy, concubinage, and monogamy again, in outward form at least.

Everywhere there was a thirst for power, some imposition of authority, divine or human. Everywhere the human mind was chained, or an effort made to chain it; and

allegiance was demanded from those below to some one or something above: to king, noble, priest; to lord, knight, master; to husband, father; to State, to Church. Women, likewise, as wives or daughters to those in power, demanded and received allegiance from those below by virtue of reflected glory.

In time, too, the Church grew powerful and demanded subjection from all alike, from the king down to the humblest peasant in the land; for as the State and the king ruled over things temporal, so the Church and the priest ruled over things eternal, and by divine authority held the keys to heaven and hell, while man ruled over woman, and none were free.

So it was that while woman, the creature of man's desire and the victim of nature, was mainly and of necessity concerned with the things of life, man, in his freer moments, began to concern himself with the things of the spirit. He would be free.

Little by little, through infinite pain and travail, in which the woman shared, then by leaps and bounds, his ideal grew into a

great desire. He flung away his kings, his priests, his traditions, and his chains. He would be free at any cost. He claimed his freedom by inherent right, by natural law, by reason's power. Liberty, equality, fraternity, for men as men, was what he claimed. Unfortunately, the most ardent champions of liberty considered women outside the pale.

By nature all men were created free and equal. They said it, preached it, wrote it, printed it. By nature woman was created for the use of man. She was his inferior, designed for other things than liberty — for instance, duty. This had been said so long a time, preached for so many centuries, printed, taught, written, that in their leisure hours the apostles of liberty devised skilful and clever arguments, though scarcely logical, to prove the case. Man existed, they claimed, for his own ultimate satisfaction and development as a rational human being, and woman was created for the express purpose of aiding man's development as a rational being and increasing his satisfaction in life.

Such was the status of men and women as late as the eighteenth century. Such was

the current thought while our nation was as yet a loose federation of colonies, subject to the control of England, the mother country.

It was Mary Wollstonecraft, a woman of Britain, who pricked this bubble of man's conceit, who tore off the veil of sentimentality from his alluring idea and showed it in all its hideous deformity and its debasing effects. She was not the first champion of her sex, but one of the stanchest, perhaps the most philosophical of them all. Her book, "A Vindication of the Rights of Woman," published in 1792, created a profound sensation. The American Declaration of Independence was an accomplished fact, the Revolution was now history, and the United States of America was a nation among the nations of the earth.

It had been a century of strenuous thoughts and great deeds. All were familiar with ideas of liberty. Conversation ran upon such ideas as these: inherent rights, rights of man, universal reason, law of nature, law of reason, natural rights. They talked about being "free born," of "the

Mary Wollstonecraft

sovereignty of the people," meaning always men people. Literature teemed with these ideas. Preachers preached them, teachers taught them.

They varied these high-sounding notions with notions about "governments deriving their just powers from consent of the governed." They insisted upon coupling the right of taxation with that of representation, on the ground of "human rights." These, they claimed, were the natural rights of man.

Naturally, Mary Wollstonecraft's book created a sensation. It was about the rights of woman and heretofore no one had considered much about woman except in regard to her "duties." For the time being, her words fell on deaf ears. So far as our forefathers were concerned, great men though they were, they were not great enough to throw off the prejudice of centuries of thought, and in a country dedicated to freedom, a government erected on natural rights and founded on the equality of men as men, they entered upon their "birthright," refusing to erase the stigma of inferiority from the mothers who in pain and travail brought

forth the men who were by the law of nature, "born free and equal."

Mary Wollstonecraft was not the only one who had espoused the cause of woman. There was one, ages ago, who spoke eloquently for her, advocating equal rights, equal opportunities for the sexes. He believed not only in the economic freedom of women, but also in free motherhood. His name was Plato.

It is maintained that Plato did not esteem highly the women of his time, for in the main he could not, but that he saw great possibilities in the sex. He realized that without the development and coöperation of women, the race was bound to deteriorate; but that with equal opportunities and equal development for men and women, an almost ideal society could evolve.

Since his time there have been others to champion the cause of woman. Cornelius Agrippa published in 1509 a work of some thirty chapters to prove the "superiority of woman." Half a century later, in 1552, another writer came to the same conclusion, and

brought out a book based upon the philosophy of Plato. Still another near the end of the sixteenth century, 1599, went on record in favor of the sex of his mother and published a book with the imposing title, "A Woman's Worth defended against all the Men in the World, proving her to be more Perfect, Excellent, and Absolute, in All Virtuous Actions, than any man of What Quality Soever." [1]

It is a philosophical maxim that a pendulum set in motion is bound to swing from one extreme to the other; so, while some were urging the superiority of women, others harked back to the gloomy past, and argued that women were beings not even endowed with reason. No longer could such insults go unchallenged, however, for the Renaissance had begun, and some women, at least, shared in the awakening of that magic time, and learned to use their pens to good effect in defence of their long-defamed sex.

The foremost literary country of Europe was Italy, where naturally there would be

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. I, Chap. I.

women of learning, if anywhere. George Eliot has given us a delightful picture of the cultured, scholarly woman of that time in her "Romola," showing how easily and naturally such women might have been produced under the stimulus of overwhelming enthusiasm for knowledge as knowledge. One of these Italian women, Lucrezia Morinella of Venice, in the exuberance of her enthusiam, and perhaps to stem the flood of egoism which bid fair to overwhelm the opposite sex, wrote a work entitled, "The Nobleness and Excellence of Women, together with the Faults and Imperfections of Men." In view of the past, it is really strange there have not been more of such books written; for surely they are pardonable.

More proofs of the new age and better thought came also with the seventeenth century. The printing press was liberating human minds, breaking down tradition and superstition. Essays and books were written in defence of women, not only by those outside the Church, but by the clergy as well. A "History of Women" and several

large works upon the same general subject were produced by men, while Daniel Defoe so far anticipated the future as to wish an "institute founded for the better education of young women." [1] In his own words:

"We reproach the sex every day for folly and impertinence, while I am confident that had they the advantages of education equal to us, they would be guilty of less than ourselves."

It is often claimed that the founder of Christianity, apart from religious conceptions, merits the gratitude of women for what he has done for them. Candor compels the honest conviction that much of the good he did personally was, and still is, nullified by the positive commands of his most noted follower, one Saul of Tarsus. Likewise Peter, in his teaching concerning the "weaker vessel," did much to exclude woman from the benefits of the doctrine of Jesus, summed up in the phrase "the infinite value of man as man," which is supposed to be the original inspiration of the democratic

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. I, Chap. I.

ideal together with the idea of the "brotherhood of man" and the "fatherhood of God." Incalculable, though, is the mischief that has been caused by the story known as the "Fall of Man," a story more widely disseminated than was ever the Sermon on the Mount.

It was, no doubt, in the exaltation of Mary, mother of Jesus, as "Queen of Heaven" and an object of adoration with her little son, that much was done indirectly for the elevation of her sex, and some of Paul's influence perhaps counteracted. Because of the idea of one sacred motherhood, gradually all motherhood is becoming sacred, in theory at least, and because of one sacred childhood, all childhood began to come into its own; but even yet it has not entirely arrived at that fair goal.

As an immediate result, however, romantic love was fostered and extravagant reverence was paid to young and beautiful women. The knight vowed not only eternal allegiance to his Lady in heaven, but eternal devotion to his own lady on earth. All womankind, indeed, or so at times we seem to read it, felt the softening influence of the "Lady in

Heaven"; for with a gentle woman there, one who was also a tender mother, a kindly "Queen" with whom one might plead for grace and special favors, and who was thought to answer such prayers personally, the whole sex shared somewhat in the reflected glory.

It is indeed to the credit of the Roman Church and the Greek as well, that along with the Son they exalted the Mother to godhead and heaven. None of the reform churches have done women this honor; instead, they have dragged the Mother down and left the Son in glory with his Father.

It was, therefore, mainly in a romantic way and by inference that this idea of Mary's semi-divinity reacted upon woman, for in spite of the "Mother of God" the churches still preach woman's inferiority, her natural impurity, even going so far as to refuse to allow her to take the eucharist in her naked hands, because of her "uncleanness." She was never allowed to forget the "curse of Eve," though "Adam's curse" was seldom mentioned, for it was held that there was a new dispensation where man was

concerned. Nor was the severity of the canon and the civil law lessened, which discriminated most unjustly against the sex of the "Mother of God." They did not stop to reason that if, according to their doctrine, "by woman sin came into the world," by woman also came God into the world.

They cursed all women for the sake of the sin of one; why did not they forgive and honor all women for the sake of the service of the other? If, too, Jesus, the "Son of Man," was the "new Adam," bringing in a new dispensation for all mankind, then why should not Mary have been the "new Eve," bringing in a new dispensation for all womankind? One has but to read the laws that have disgraced Christendom to learn that even to this day the curse of Eve is still in operation against her daughters, except in the few places where equal rights prevail.[1]

Nor was chivalry, which in a way grew out of the idea of the divinity of Mary, incom-

[1] See "Mr. Lex," by Catharine Waugh McCulloch, for examples of Illinois law regarding women. Published, 1899.

patible with highly divergent ideals; for the knight as lord, even while honoring his lady, had "rights" [1] which even the humblest virgin and the villain's bride dared not disallow. But though the pages of history are stained with the foulest crimes against woman, the leavening was at work; for if we still share the curse of Eve, we also in a way share the diadem of Mary, and childhood reaps to-day the good fruits of the little Son.

It was women mainly who spread the faith of the Nazarene. If, then, Christianity be the salvation of the world, women have helped largely to purchase that salvation; and it is the irony of fate that in the face of this fact the clergy of the Christian Church have ever been the bitterest opponents of freedom for the daughters of Mother Eve.

When persecutions raged, the sex of women but made their lot the harder. They, too, were put to the sword, thrown to wild

[1] Known as "Marquette." See "Woman, Church, and State," by Matilda Joslyn Gage.

beasts, or burned with fire as living torches to grace a Nero's feast, but not until they were despoiled of chastity,—a fate for Christian maids and matrons worse than death itself.

The blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church, so the Church grew strong and powerful, but never once was it so much as hinted that the crime of Adam's wife, if crime it was, could be washed away in the blood shed by her daughters that the Church of the Redeemer might live and prosper through the ages. The burden laid by the Church upon the frail shoulders of woman was heavy indeed.

With the Reformation, the grasp of the Church upon her was loosened, and liberty became something more than a dream when at last freedom of thought and conscience was proclaimed. Nor was all the blood shed by men alone in that tempestuous and fateful time; women also paid the penalty of death, and paid it willingly in order to be free. If, in the long ago, one of the sex did err, have not her daughters paid the debt in full with blood and tears and shame? What

more is needed? In justice, who dares to ask for more?

In striving for the honor of martyrdom it seems sex is no bar to the honors, no handicap. In the arena of death, men do not press the question of the superiority of their kind, nor have they ever contended that there woman was out of her divinely appointed sphere. Upon that platform she has never been denied admission; and thus is it proved that women, as well as men, have died gloriously for freedom's sake.

Men as kings were thought to be the only rightful rulers, designed by nature herself for such high office, yet in a dearth of royal men, women became queens in their own right, and proved themselves as capable as kings. Among these queens were Cleopatra of Egypt, Boadicea, the warrior queen of the Britons, Olga and Catherine the Great of Russia, Maria Theresa of Austria-Hungary, Mary Stuart of Scotland, Anne, Victoria and Elizabeth, the great "virgin queen," of England, all of whom showed a genius for the role.

In his book "The Subjection of Women," John Stuart Mill proved conclusively that the very thing from which women are most shut out ordinarily — government and governing — was the very thing for which apparently they were most fitted and for which they had the greatest genius. By numerous examples he proved that women in supreme power were more successful as a rule than men. Their reigns were usually marked by great progress in the peaceful arts and the well-being of their subjects. They seemed intuitively to choose wise men to help them in their councils. It can scarcely be said of male monarchs that such is usually the case, or that they have a gift for choosing the wisest women to help them guide the ship of state. By inference it may be assumed that that government is best which unites the wisdom of women with the wisdom of men.

As for the soldier test, if there were but the one example, the Maid of Domremy, it might suffice to prove either that military genius of a high order may dwell in the woman mind, or that, after all, such genius

is but the capacity to inspire enthusiasm in the rank and file of those who fight. Were justice done, history no doubt would be full of examples of the patriotism and devotion of women to their country or to some beloved cause. Woman's wit has saved many a day which the bayonet itself was powerless to save.

Not, however, to take life, but to give it, is woman's greatest function. Not to destroy life, but to conserve it, is her task. Who, then, would ask women to be soldiers when every mother is a soldier, offering her life freely if need be, that another might live? Not to compass death, but to preserve carefully what life there is and make it worth the living — this should be the goal of all civilizations, as in the main it has been the ideal of womankind since earliest ages.

Such, briefly, is the progress of woman through the historical centuries, and the part she has played; such is the burden of thought under which, too often, she still labors. Back of the historic woman lies the immeasurable past wherein the prehistoric

woman [1] figured, whose story we are slowly learning, and profoundly is she influencing our thought to-day. It was only in the last century that we learned to know her. In time to come women will gratefully acknowledge the debt they owe to Darwin, Wallace, and the whole evolutionary school, for science, evolving a nobler religion, built upon the highest ethics of the past, will save not only woman, but the race itself.

But the status of woman, what of that? for in the short story here being told we have not yet arrived at the scientific age. The lover praised his mistress to the skies; the poet lauded the charms, the beauty, and the virtue of the maid; the priest thundered forth bitter denunciations on all womankind, holding them responsible for all the ills of man. Woman was the seducer of the race. But for her weakness, her cupidity, humanity would have been as guileless as the cherubs in a dream, and the earth had been as paradise.

Thus woman, her brief period of transient beauty gone, her power gone with her bloom,

[1] See "Evolution of Woman." Eliza B. Gamble.

her sceptre passed into some younger hand, her crown upon some fairer brow, woman was fain to be content to bewail in ashes and in sackcloth the misdeed of her shadowy ancestress, and to devote herself to serving humbly him who had lost Eden through that awful sin, and to look upon her sex as the source of all her glory and her woe.

So growing side by side were extravagant notions of woman's worth, her fineness, and her virtue; and also of her natural and God-ordained inferiority, her duties, and her sphere. What wonder there was confusion, and that chaos reigned?

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST HEROINES OF A NEW WORLD

IF to man alone belongs the honor of finding new lands and discovering new continents, not to him alone belongs the honor of subduing what he has found, for ever in the task of making new homes in new places, woman has been the brave and efficient copartner of man. Not in Indian fashion, one behind the other in single file, but hand in hand and keeping pace together step by step, men and women have taken possession of the uttermost parts of the earth.

Wherever man has gone to find a habitation, woman has borne him company. Together they have suffered and struggled on; together they have toiled and wrought. If, then, she is the weaker vessel, bravely has she done her part, for never has the arduousness of her lot excused her from the mother's

peril; and if he has risked his life in unknown dangers, she has doubly risked her life to be with him. If then, together they have borne the cross, surely in all justice together they should wear the crown, if there be one, and reap the common benefits.

The story of the Woman Movement in America begins apparently with failure, for although many of the original settlers came here to seek liberty, they had no intention of granting it. Not alone to dissenters and outsiders did they refuse the liberty they themselves demanded, but the age-long habit of regarding woman as an inferior and under a special ban, was too strong to be broken even under the peculiar conditions of the New World.

In a way it was inevitable that the wild frontier life should have reduced them to an almost primitive state. The women were indeed brave, even as were the men, who, for the sake of conscience, left civilization behind them and faced the terrors and privations of a primeval world. There was a breadth of education in the experience that

no books could teach nor any institution impart. They faced the big problems of life and grew big in solving them.

It is often asserted and seems indeed to be true, that in a new country, under new conditions, woman is accorded a higher place, a more human field, than in the older civilizations. It is as if in facing primitive conditions, in going back again to the origin of things, both man and woman get back to fundamental principles, to a semblance of that equality which a just Creator must have designed for them. There may be less of bowing, of complimenting, of ball-room courtesies, but there is more of the true respect of one fellow-being for another.

It is impossible, though, for people completely and at once to readjust themselves to a new life and to new conceptions as well. It is perhaps too much to expect that in a brief ocean voyage, though it lasted many weeks, men would outgrow the traditions of centuries of thought, especially the men who made a business of remembering traditions. So it happened that when Anne Hutchinson, full of zeal and power, tried to live her life

Anne Hutchinson

as a human being with human rights, though in a new country to which she had come seeking freedom, as a member of a community ostensibly dedicated to the cause of liberty, she found herself really living in the midst of all the tyranny of the country and the people she had fled.

It was this way. Anne Hutchinson had something to say, and she wanted to say it. Had she been a silent woman, she never would have dreamed but that she was a free and independent being in a free and independent community. But she wanted to preach, and preach she would, and there the trouble lay. She had listeners in plenty, and followers, too.

It all came about innocently enough. The Bible was their all-in-all; sermons, exhortations, and prayers were the order of the day, though all these things were usually considered the prerogatives of the men. The women were expected to do the listening. But even on the way over to America, Anne Hutchinson, perhaps to beguile the tediousness of the long and tiresome voyage, was wont to gather the women about her and discuss the sermons they had heard. She her-

self preached as well, only she did not call it preaching. When finally she arrived at her new home, it was not long before she was opening her house twice every week to her woman friends, and thus began what was undoubtedly the first woman's club in America.[1]

Besides her ability as a spiritual teacher she had a way with her in nursing that endeared her to her friends and neighbors. She was a natural physician; and being also a woman of wealth, she became the foremost woman of her time and community.

All would have gone well, perhaps, but that some of her male compatriots, jealous of her growing power and influence, sought for a means to restrain her; for not only women but men, some of them the most influential, were being drawn into the circle of her hearers and admirers. It must have been that Mistress Hutchinson's twice-a-week lectures drew larger numbers than those which were established for men only, in charge of the ministers of the Gospel, else it is strange that they should have found fault with her

[1] Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days. Brooks.

for talking to the women. However that might be, according to accounts some of her adherents grew haughty and discriminating; they found fault with their preachers and asked them uncomfortable questions about obscure points of doctrine; and before long the whole colony for miles around was engaged in bitter and endless theological dissensions that mean little or nothing to us of this day, but which at that time were apparently of the most vital importance to them all.

Not lightly were the spiritual teachers and natural leaders, the ordained ministers of the various flocks, to be openly flouted, and that by a woman and her followers. They began to question her teachings and to take note of them, and she was finally brought to trial for sedition and heresy. In her trial she was taken to task for assuming to teach, which was plainly against the Bible.

A woman, it was argued, by those whose prerogative it was thought she had usurped, a woman should not preach. Her place was in the home. Preaching was man's work, not woman's. She was asked by what authority

she set herself up as a teacher and a leader of people; and she answered by authority of the second chapter of Titus, third and fourth verses, that the elder women should teach the younger.

Such authority, however, did not please the court, which answered her: "So we allow you to do, as the Apostle means, privately, and upon occasion, but that gives no warrant for such set meetings for that purpose; and besides, you take upon you to teach many that are elder than yourself, neither do you teach them that which the Apostle commands, namely, to keep at home."

Nothing daunted, Mistress Hutchinson returned: "Will you please to give me a rule against it, and I will yield?"

"You must have a rule for it, or else you cannot do it in faith; yet you have a rule against it: 'I permit not a woman to teach,'" the court replied, as though that ended the whole matter.

"That is meant of teaching men," the defendant rejoined; and so the whole question was threshed out about the sphere of woman, her natural inferiority was hinted at, and

God's law expounded. After the fashion of the times, every question was thought to be settled by an appropriate quotation from the Bible; so the teachings of Moses, Peter, Paul, and others, together with their own hair-splitting on hazy points of immaterial theology came in to complicate the message which one woman felt called upon to deliver to her sisters. There was much objection to her message, but they put much stress upon the idea that a woman should not aspire to preach and teach. It ended in the banishment of Anne Hutchinson from the colony of Massachusetts.[1]

With her went her family, a few loyal friends and one Mary Dyer, a woman who later paid with her life the penalty for trespassing upon the sacred rights of man, particularly the right to speak in public and to believe according to one's own conscience. Later she became a Quaker, no doubt because the Quakers allowed women to speak outside

[1] "Antinomianism in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay," including the "Short Story" and Other Documents.

See also "Anne Hutchinson" in "Little Journeys" by Elbert Hubbard.

their homes, and Mary Dyer would also preach; for she too had something to say, and wanted to say it. She was warned a number of times, but ignored the warning, for Massachusetts had stringent laws against those with whom they disagreed on subtle points in theology. As for Mary Dyer, she was a woman preacher and a Quaker, and she was hanged for the crime!

Naturally, the woman movement did not flourish in Massachusetts. They had a way of discouraging strong women, a way that was most effective and lasting in its consequences, and without strong women there can be no woman movement. So they had peace in this particular for many years.

The Hutchinson party of outcasts found its way to Providence, Rhode Island, where they were welcomed by Roger Williams and his colony. To this man is accorded the honor of establishing freedom of speech and conscience in America, and of being the first to maintain that the civil power has no right to interfere with the opinions of men

and women, or with their ideas upon any subject.

The end of Mistress Hutchinson was tragic indeed, even as was that of her friend, Mary Dyer. After the death of William Hutchinson, her husband, she removed with her family to the outskirts of the Manhattan colony, which was settled by the Dutch, and not long afterwards the family was attacked by Indians, and all were murdered except one child, which was carried into captivity. So perished the first strong woman of America, the first real leader of her sex in the New World.

Anne Hutchinson was not a university graduate. No college had set its mark upon her. She was one of those who do not really need an institution to perfect her. She was not educated by books, but learned in the things that cannot well be taught. She was steeped in the wisdom of those who live and do their own thinking. She might have passed through an alma mater, though, without ever losing her individuality or impairing her usefulness; for she would have known the true function of her mater,

would have absorbed deeply what she needed there; but such a personality as hers would never have been swallowed up or reduced to the common level of college mediocrity. In the days of Anne Hutchinson, however, women did not go to school.

In a way, Anne Hutchinson was a "woman's righter," but she probably did not realize the fact. She was too big to let a mere accident of birth deter her. She did not hold herself responsible for her sex, and, if the truth were known, I believe she staked her life upon her rights as a human being, and not as a woman. In this she antedated Mary Dyer and Mary Wollstonecraft and the hosts that were to follow after.

Quite different from the stormy and tragic life of Mistress Hutchinson was that of Mistress Margaret Brent, of Maryland, who came to America just four years after the first-named lady had set her foot upon the soil of freedom. But both were alike in this, that each was strong and brave, each showed the evidence of a brilliant mind, and each was a woman of wealth and importance when she

arrived. Mistress Hutchinson came with a husband, fifteen children (all her own), and a goodly sum in gold; Mistress Margaret arrived with sister, brothers, and servants. One came to the bleak, inhospitable shore of New England; the other to the inviting shore of Maryland.

Apparently both were women of magnetism and personal charm, for like Mistress Anne, Mistress Margaret was high in favor with those in authority; though whether Margaret was the sweetheart or the close friend or a near relative of the first Governor of Maryland, Leonard Calvert, has not yet been fully decided. However, it matters not. The fact remains that he had the greatest confidence in her, for when Governor Calvert died, in 1647, he made Mistress Brent his sole executrix, telling her briefly to "take all and pay all"; and it seems she followed his words to the letter.

Without delay she possessed herself of his house and all his property. Not only that, but she calmly assumed his position as Lord Baltimore's attorney, and claimed the right to receive all the rents and profits of his

lordship's estates, and to attend to all the disbursements as well, just as Governor Calvert had done; for it was quite natural that the Governor should be the agent of his elder brother, Lord Baltimore.

There was much amazement at her assumption of authority, and some controversy regarding the legality of her procedure as Leonard Calvert's executrix, and her assumption of his attorneyship; so she promptly took the matter to law, where it was quite as promptly settled in her favor. The men of Maryland were either not so stubborn or not so cold as those of Massachusetts, or else Mistress Margaret was more convincing than Mistress Anne. That she did all this without the knowledge or the consent of the gentleman most concerned, Lord Baltimore, apparently did not trouble her in the least.

All this is interesting, chiefly in that it leads up to the most important act she ever did, that is, important in the light of modern events; for Mistress Margaret Brent, of St. Mary's City, Maryland, away back in the first half of the seventeenth century, was the first avowed suffragist. That she was the

first contender for the rights of women must be conceded, for when the General Assembly convened after the death of Governor Calvert, she actually went before that august body and calmly demanded not only the right to sit with them as a member of the Legislature, but the right to cast *two votes*, one as Leonard Calvert's executrix, and the other as the attorney of Lord Baltimore! Surely no man could ask for more.

With the old English idea of property qualification as a basis for the franchise, it was not bad reasoning, but it takes a brave and daring woman to make such astounding claims. Truly she was ahead of her times. Moreover, she must have seen clearly the immense importance of the right of suffrage when she claimed the right to cast two votes, one for a man who was dead, and one for a man across the seas. Just what would have happened had her claim been allowed, is hard to tell. It is hinted that she might easily have become Governor, yet indeed, as Lord Baltimore's attorney and Leonard Calvert's heir, she must have been virtually the ruler of the colony. Had she become Governor

in name as well, her appointment might have changed the whole course of American history, so far as women are and were concerned.

Perhaps, had it not been for Governor Green, the successor of Governor Calvert, Mistress Brent might have prevailed upon the astonished legislators and gained her point, but he arose in his dignity and wounded pride and refused absolutely to grant her request. Like her countrywoman up in the northern colony, Mistress Margaret had succeeded in arousing masculine jealousy, and was made to feel the weight of such wounded dignity. But no one can take from her the proud distinction of being the first woman in America to demand the right to vote, and the still greater distinction of demanding the right to sit in a legislative assembly as a member thereof. Such splendid assumption of individual rights should have been better rewarded.

When finally the news concerning her strange and unusual doings travelled over to England and reached Lord Baltimore's ears, he, evidently not knowing her, was very

angry. He wrote sharply to his General Assembly and chided them for allowing such a state of affairs to go on; for Maryland belonged to the Lord Cecil Baltimore by virtue of a royal grant of land from his friend, King Charles the First of England, and he was privileged to chide the General Assembly if he so chose. But Mistress Margaret Brent was too important a personage to be so treated, and even though the General Assembly had refused her the honor of a seat with them and refused her the right to cast either one vote or two, they would not allow her to be discourteously censured; so they wrote back to His Lordship and told the wrathy gentleman that he was lucky in having so capable an agent as Mistress Brent. The lady, it seems, had the capacity for inspiring not only admiration but stanch loyalty in her masculine friends.[1]

Surely the first dauntless contender for political and civil rights for women, or rather for herself as a woman, was a credit to the cause. She was self-reliant, independent, brave, daring, strong-minded to a degree,

[1] Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days. Brooks.

and must also have been what seems so necessary to a woman's good repute, pleasing to the other sex, and likewise charming. It is pleasant to think that she lost nothing by her bold stand, but evidently gained much, though she probably never dreamed that she was a type of the women who would one day prevail.

CHAPTER III

WOMEN OF THE REVOLUTION: THEY SHARED THE COST BUT NOT THE GAIN OF THE GREAT STRUGGLE

IT is only to be expected that the women of America in the early days should have had a passion for liberty, though it is not to be wondered at that they did not at once make a personal application of its principles. It must be remembered that religion of some kind was universal and, as a rule, religions have ever taught the subjection of women to men.

It has so long been taught that man and wife are one, and that one the man; also that man and woman are the two unequal halves of a whole, that it takes a Wollstonecraft and legions of men and women to refute the statement. The theory is still hedged around with so many ingenious fancies, such fulsome

flatteries, such delicate and doubtful compliments; is bolstered up with such seeming chivalry, the whole so veiled with romance, that many women still cling to it and cherish it, while unthinking men can see no harm in so flattering a belief.

Had it been reduced to a mathematical proposition it would long since have been rejected as absurd, along with the flatness of the earth, the daily journey of the sun, and other cheerful stories of the past. The proposition, "One superior half, a large male being, plus one inferior half, a small female being, is equal to one perfect whole, a man," would never have been accepted as a true equation, for it is well known and generally agreed that the two halves to a perfect whole are identical in equality. The proposition should stand: "One man plus one woman equals two whole persons," even in marriage; no more, no less.

So far as is known there were not a great many women among all those patriots who saw clearly through the principle of liberty and made personal application thereof. Abigail Smith Adams, wife of John Adams, who

afterwards became President of the United States, was one who did. She it was who threatened, half in fun and half in earnest, to "foment a rebellion among the ladies if their rights were not recognized in the making of the new Constitution."

While her husband was in the Continental Congress, some months before the Declaration of Independence was signed, she wrote to him as follows:

"I long to hear you have declared an independency, and, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention are not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion and will not hold ourselves bound to obey any laws in which we have no voice nor representation."

Had it not been for the deadening influence of the theological belief in the inferiority of

women as women, and their place in the divine scheme; had it not been for the pernicious philosophy that grew out of that belief and permeated society as a whole, leaving its baleful marks on the minds, persons, manners, and morals of those chiefly concerned, the women of revolutionary times might have risen to their heritage of human rights and been included in the great political scheme, for better or for worse.

It would seem that never were women endowed with a more glorious heritage of physical courage, indomitable bravery, the will to do and dare, than women of that day. They sprang from generations of men and women who faced the elemental forces of the world. They who sought the solitudes of the forests, the plains, and hills of an unconquered land, who faced cold and heat, rain and snow, deprivation, famine, pestilence, war, and massacre for a principle, had courage enough to give to their offspring, both male and female, for many generations.

Each generation of colonists had its full quota of horrors, of dangers bravely faced, of grim defeat; each fireside must have had

its ghost. They did not have to read history; they lived it.

Men, women, and children, they were soldiers of fortune. They often slept upon their arms. On a moment's warning they were ready to fight or die for the liberty and rights they had wrested from a king across the seas, for the homes and possessions they had wrested from a primeval world. We can well imagine that the children, girls as well as boys, were well instructed in the possible dangers all around them, and were well grounded in courage and all it implied. Tragedy stalked with them sometimes hand in hand; treachery and death might overtake them at any hour.

Many a stormy night, with doors bolted and windows barred, they must have sat and listened with bated breath and beating hearts to tales, true tales, told by their elders, of horrors which even then might be hovering near. The distant coyote might be a savage yell, the ghostly creak a savage tread. Redskin, war, and witchcraft; pestilence, famine, death; sorrows all. The distant home across the seas; the Old World and its ways; perse-

cutions, flight, and homesickness in a hostile, cruel land — such was the price they gladly paid for what they conceived was liberty. Such must have been the burden of their tales.

Better days came. Burdens grew lighter, life easier, but it was still a race courageous, a race ready to sacrifice all save honor for liberty. The air was full of the "rights of man," and since the days of Cromwell and Milton, and even long before, men had dared to talk of limiting the rights of kings.

Government and its functions had been discussed for centuries by various philosophers, and to a people who have struggled with the problems of establishing a Government in a new land under new conditions such discussions must have had a remarkable fascination. They were brought up on charter-making and Constitutional rights. Moreover, most of the original settlers had come to these shores for the sake of some principle that seemed vital.

Not lightly, then, would they give up the liberties they had gained, nor relinquish the principles in which they believed. At that

time life was hard enough for all to do some serious thinking, and it is unlikely that the women of the families escaped from some share in discussions of the great themes that often held the men.

However that may be, the women of Revolution times threw themselves heart and soul into the strife and urged resistance to what they conceived was tyranny. It is strange that women, who are usually accused of taking everything in a personal sense, did not apply the philosophy of the times to themselves. It was the men in this case who made the personal application of the doctrine of the rights of man, and the women who seemed to see the broader application; for to most of them it meant separation and independence of the colonies as a nation, while to the men it seemed to mean the triumph of their individual rights as human beings.

Nobly did the women play their part in the struggle for liberty. While the men fought, they carried on the business of life, they cared for their homes and the children; their babies were often born within sound of musketry and cannons' boom. They nursed

the soldiers, collected and carried supplies to them. They played the part of spies and messengers, but many of the stories of their individual heroism have been allowed to become tradition.

In her "Women of the American Revolution," Mrs. Ellet tells the story, among many others, of one young girl, a South Carolinian, Dicey Langston by name, a girl yet in her teens, who was the heroine of an adventure which makes the famous ride of Paul Revere seem like a pleasant moonlight excursion.

No fleet steed was hers to tell off the weary miles with flying feet, but alone and on foot, over marshes, through creeks and lonely woods, she made her way for miles one night to warn a settlement of Liberty People that the Loyalists were planning a murderous raid upon them. The little settlement lay upon the other side of the river Tyger. When she finally came to it, black and swollen with recent rains, her heart failed her, for even in ordinary times it was difficult to ford. Her hesitation was but momentary; in she plunged, sometimes up to her neck in the seething waters, determined to go on with her

errand or die in the attempt. For a time she struggled, confused and frightened, in the river channel, having lost her way in the darkness of the night and the rush of the flood. Finally, however, she reached the opposite bank and hastened, wet and dripping, to warn the settlement of its danger.

Another story[1] tells of a decisive battle won by the colonists chiefly through the aid rendered by two young girls, Hannah and Rebecca Weston. From scarcity of gunpowder the men and boys had hastily armed themselves with scythes, pitchforks, and other implements, and set out to avenge an insult offered to them. After they had gone, a quantity of powder was discovered. Every available man and boy had left the village, and as success might depend upon the powder reaching them in time, the two girls volunteered to take it to them.

It was a two days' journey through an almost trackless forest, the way being indicated by blazed trees, and involved camping out in

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. I, p. 203.

the solitudes for one night. There was danger from wild animals, the woods being infested with wolves, wildcats, and bears, to say nothing of the greater danger of falling in with roving bands of savages and being carried away to captivity or death. But the girls made their trip in safety, their powder being a welcome and effective aid in the victory that followed.

These are but two incidents among many showing the courage and intrepidity of women and young girls. Such things were not put in the military journals. Men accepted these services quite as a matter of course, bestowing perhaps some graceful compliment to reward the heroines for their bravery.

How many of the women did hope that the new Government might be a real democracy and not simply a male autocracy will never now be known. Mercy Otis Warren, the sister of James Otis, is said to have been the first one to whisper the word "separation," and to have counselled it, while even Washington and Adams were denying the possibil-

ity of such a step. Her home was practically the headquarters of the rebellion.

She was the first to base the struggle on "inherent rights," yet she advocated the policy of women pretending to be "inferior," because it pleased the men and did no harm. She argued with the discontented ones of her day that it was expedient so to do. Had Mrs. Warren been of like mind with Mrs. Adams, the suffragist movement would have begun in the year of grace 1776, instead of 1848, and the militant movement would long since have had historic precedent to give dignity, if dignity it needs.

As ever in all great crises, the great men of that time, who were just ordinary men after all, made great by circumstances, sought in their perplexity the advice of women; and as ever in such cases the women were sometimes bolder in thought than the men. As ever, also, the real brunt of the war fell upon the weaker sex. Far easier would it have been for those women to counsel arbitration and submission to England, to bow the neck to tyranny, but they would have none of it. They urged the war, supported it, they

let no words of discouragement fall from their lips for fear that the men might be tempted to give up the fight and capitulate. They bore the news of death and disaster with fortitude, saw with calmness their homes burned before their eyes, did not bewail wasted fortunes or personal loss, counting themselves blessed in being able to sacrifice somewhat for the glorious cause of liberty.

So strongly did the women believe that taxation without representation is tyranny, that long before the Revolution they organized anti-tea leagues and bound themselves to drink no tea until the hated tax was removed. They did more. Loyal ones refused to buy imported finery,— gloves, ribbons, feathers, the silks and fancy things so dear to feminine hearts, anything upon which a tax was placed; while to wear home-made goods became a mark of patriotism. This demand for domestic goods practically was the beginning of American industry. In those troubled times it was begun and carried on mainly by women; so the wage-earning woman of to-

day is but holding her own in industry by virtue of inheritance. It is the man, the former soldier, who is the interloper, the trespasser, if there be any.

It is a matter not only of record but of interest that while the revolutionary patriots were fighting against the mother country to maintain their fundamental principle that "taxation without representation is tyranny," Hannah Lee Corbin of Virginia protested to her brother, General Richard Henry Lee, that it was just as wrong to tax women without allowing them the right to vote as it was to tax men under the same conditions. It must have been his belief that he was fighting to maintain the equal rights of all the people, not merely, as it turned out to be, the rights of men people, for he replied to her that women were "already possessed of that right." No doubt the more liberal-minded among them did not dream but that complete equality was to be established for all free-born people by virtue of the great Declaration of Independence. However that might be, it is stated that the women of Virginia did have the right of franchise

at an early date, while in New Jersey it was secured to them for almost a third of a century, when it fell into disrepute.[1]

Ever loyal and patriotic, as women always are, they organized themselves into societies called "The Daughters of Liberty," to cultivate the spirit of the times, to keep it from dying an early death. But besides their anti-tea leagues, their correspondence committees, their interminable duties, their domestic industries, their active coöperation with the real warfare, women for the first time showed the possibilities of organized feminine effort in relief work, the work that has now become almost a commonplace in time of war or when great disasters occur. Esther De Bredy Reed, an English woman by birth, a patriot by marriage, practically began the movement. Thus in many ways the women proved their worth as loyal patriots.

Ida M. Tarbell says that the "practice of looking sympathetically after the needs of the soldiers was set by Martha Washington

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. I, pp. 33, 447.

herself in the Winter of 1777–78." Indeed, it is recorded that she spent that dreadful winter at Valley Forge with her husband, General Washington, doing her best to alleviate the suffering and keep up the spirits of the men by her ministrations.

The war over, their share in all the duties and sorrows of that time forgotten, the mothers of our country found themselves ignored in the new Government by the fathers, who appropriated for themselves the rights for which they all had contended. For how can a war be fought, unless the women do their part? Unless the women plough, sow, and reap, unless they buy and sell, pay taxes, nurse the wounded, gather supplies; unless they themselves help furnish the sinews of war, all this in addition to their own routine labors, how are battles to be fought and won?

The soldier argument against women as citizens is somewhat shabby, for it stands to reason that women can serve a cause far more effectively in their own way than they could as soldiers. He who spends his time campaigning would starve or die of exposure un-

less there were others at work to see that he is fed and clothed.

At that time, under an unstable Government, with limited resources and scant credit, this must have been mainly woman's work. To-day there are still living many women who can tell how, during the Civil War, they banded together to "sew for the soldiers, and make bandages and lint for them." This was but a small part of the extra burdens imposed upon women during war times, though the soldier argument is still used against them.

Evidently Mrs. Adams did not foment her rebellion as she promised. Even as in our day, most women must have conceived of liberty as something concerning men alone. When men set out to achieve freedom they mass together and fight class against class, foe against foe, the women aiding them in their struggle. It is a fight to the death. When women wish for liberty it has too much of the personal element in it to be exactly comfortable. Not a class against a class, but sometimes a woman against a man, is the

way it is likely to resolve itself. As it is in our later days, it was at that time too personal a matter. It might seem disloyal to the ones they most loved.

Men have long since grown enthusiastic over limiting the "divine right" of kings, but they scent treason in any discussion concerning, even remotely, the "divine rights" of husbands. So the men formed their Government, looked after their own rights, and took up the burden of life again. Like certain statesmen of our own day, they were fully convinced that women were unfit for self-government. It was the divine order of things, and who would question the divine? Had not Milton, the great apostle of liberty, written long ago concerning the beginning of such things:

"To whom thus Eve, with perfect beauty adorn'd;
'My Author and Disposer, what thou bid'st,
Unargued I obey; so God ordains;
God is thy law, thou mine; to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.'"

When Mary Wollstonecraft's book appeared, it was too late, so far as American women were concerned. Had the French Revolution preceded that of America, perhaps the later philosophy of that time had triumphed, in the New World, at least. The French philosopher, Condorcet, pleaded eloquently for equal rights for women in 1787. Theodore Stanton says, "His essay 'On the Admission of Women to Citizenship' sounds like an article in *The Boston Woman's Journal.*" Nor did he stand alone among men of that time and country in his contention for the emancipation of women.

John Adams was acquainted with the views of Condorcet, but was unimpressed by them. The Constitution must have been an accomplished fact before he came in contact with the Frenchman's liberal ideas. Milton, Rousseau, and all their ilk, expounders of human rights for men only, had triumphed; the Government came into being a male autocracy and was launched upon its career with a limited manhood suffrage, false to the ideals and untrue to the great principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Rousseau, their famous contemporary, like Milton an ardent supporter of the "rights of man," had spoken in no uncertain strain concerning the "duties of women." To quote him:

"For this reason the education of women should always be relative to men. To please, to be useful to us, to make us love and esteem them, to educate us when young, and take care of us when grown up; to advise, to console us, to render our lives easy and agreeable, these are the duties of women at all times, and what they should be taught in their infancy."

This kind of philosophy and much more to the same effect, coming on top of centuries of preaching, on top of the testimony of Moses and Paul, fully convinced the fathers of our country that the principles which so thrilled them did not apply to mere women. Of course, all men were born free and equal: Liberty was the inalienable right of man. What more, then, could a woman ask than the supreme privilege of yoking herself with one who was born into the world with "inalienable rights"?

CHAPTER IV

BEGINNING OF THE WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT

IT would have been a prophet, indeed, one worthy of great honor, who could have foretold the world-wide results of a talk between two American women walking arm-in-arm down Great Queen Street in London, one evening some seventy years ago. It had been an exciting day, a never-to-be-forgotten day; and as the incidents were reviewed by the two women, they made a certain resolve that was destined to make them immortal, and was also destined to be fraught with tremendous results.

The two women had met for the first time in a foreign country, and became firm and life long friends. One was a gentle Quaker in modest garb and at the height of her intellectual powers; the other was a blooming

bride, in all her wedding finery, and at the beginning of a great career. The Quaker was Lucretia Mott; the bride was Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

The civilized world was at last arousing itself to protest against the crime of human slavery. Friends of the black man had called a world's convention in London, and anti-slavery societies the world over were urged to send delegates there to plead the cause of human rights for human beings.

Among those who responded to the call were Lucretia Mott, Ann Green Phillips, Sarah Pugh, Abby Kimber, Elizabeth Neal, Mary Grew, Emily Winslow, and Abby Southwick from America; besides the men delegates, among whom were Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Nathaniel P. Rogers, and Henry B. Stanton, who made the occasion his wedding journey and took his bride, Elizabeth Cady, to bear him company.

Had the English received news of an invasion from France, their ancient enemy and rival, it is said there could scarcely have been more consternation than when they

heard that America had actually sent women as delegates and that they were even then upon the way. Women! Women delegates to a world convention to discuss human rights! It was preposterous! Still, there was a woman upon the throne of England at that time, a gracious woman and one greatly beloved. Yet, as a reverend gentleman from Philadelphia pointed out, himself being jealous of his rights, clerical and otherwise:

"The reception of women as part of this convention would, in the view of many, be not only a violation of the customs of England, but of the ordinance of Almighty God, who has a right to appoint our services to his sovereign will."

To which another reverend gentleman from America responded in like vein:

"In support to the other side of this question reference has been made to your sovereign. I . . . commend to the consideration of our American female friends who are so deeply interested in this subject the example of your noble queen, who, by sanctioning her consort, his royal highness, Prince Albert, in taking the chair on an occasion not dissimilar to this, showed her

Lucretia Mott

sense of propriety by putting her head foremost in an assembly of gentlemen. I have no objection to woman's being the neck to turn the head aright, but I do not wish to see her assume the place of the head."

In vain argued the few champions of the women that women had been admitted only the year before to equal seat with men in American societies, the majority of men delegates were horrified at the mere notion of women delegates. They had called a world meeting to discuss the broad subject of human rights, and here these women were complicating matters by thrusting upon them the necessity of passing upon their credentials as delegates. As one man said with great emotion, "I feel that we are treading upon the brink of a great precipice."

The discussion ended with an overwhelming vote, that women could not properly be considered as delegates even to discuss human rights for human beings, in a world convention called for the purpose. So the devoted women, who had practically given up their lives to the cause of freeing the black man, were forced to sit silent spectators behind a

bar in the gallery, at a convention they had travelled three thousand miles to attend as delegates from accredited anti-slavery societies. Two men — delegates themselves, to their everlasting honor — bore them company and sat silent with them. They were William Lloyd Garrison and Nathaniel P. Rogers.

It was on the day on which this matter was finally settled that Lucretia Mott, the Quaker, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the bride, walked arm-in-arm up Great Queen Street; and as if by inspiration they decided, when they returned home, to call a convention, not to discuss slavery, or anti-slavery, or human rights, but woman's rights.

It was a long train of events that led up to the London convention and the presence there of female delegates and their expulsion from its councils. The loose federation of colonies had emerged into a limited male republic, with a halo of democratic ideals of the highest order, but with an actuality of human slavery and a subject womanhood. It was inevitable, therefore, that a storm

should once more rage, this time for "human rights" in essence and not for a mere political ideal for a limited number of men people.

The women of America had early seen that with them lay the hope for a future fulfilment of the great democratic ideal that so thrilled them in Revolution days and long before, the ideal that held them loyal to their principles and nerved them through their bitter struggle for what proved to be, after all, only a *male* independency. Mrs. Adams had long since pleaded, "If we mean to have heroes, statesmen, philosophers, we must have learned women"; and again, "If you complain of education in sons, what shall I say in regard to daughters, who every day experience want of it?"

Long and faithfully the women of the new male republic labored for the education of girls and women, that they might be fit to be members of this new nation of ours. The result was a broadening of woman's sphere and her entrance, by sheer pushing, into the larger life.

There were wrongs to be righted in that

larger life, and women undertook to help to right them, only to find, again and again, that, as Ida M. Tarbell says, "they had to fight for the right of fighting wrong." Every cause they took up was complicated by their entrance into the ranks. All the ancient prejudices were revived, as woman after woman, stirred to the depths of her soul by some great wrong, or feeling within her some great ideal, tried to live her life as a human being by expressing publicly that which stirred within her.

The first one to feel the full effect of public disapproval and opprobrium was Frances Wright, a Scottish woman of youth, intellect, and wealth, who, as a girl of sixteen years, heard for the first time of a country where equality of opportunity and justice actually prevailed! She came to see for herself, and what she saw decided her to give her life and fortune, if necessary, to help realize the ideals for which the nation originally stood, but which were far from being realized. She was the first woman lecturer in this country, not counting Anne Hutchinson and

Frances Wright

others who were rather preachers; and she maintained her principles sometimes at the risk of her life.

She attacked slavery, superstitions, meaningless conventions, spoke for a broader education, and was denounced as a "free-lover," an "infidel," and "a dangerous person."

Then came the Grimke sisters from South Carolina. After freeing their slaves and giving up practically all that made life dear to them, they gave themselves and their fortunes to the cause of the abolition of slavery. Angelina Grimke was an orator; her sister Sarah was a writer. The young women came North, and Angelina became first a parlor speaker, with only women in her audiences. So far so good. But already William Lloyd Garrison had begun to agitate for abolition, and there came a demand for Angelina Grimke to speak in mixed gatherings. To quote Miss Tarbell:

"Some of her best friends protested. It was not 'proper,' nor 'right,' for a woman to attempt to instruct man. But Angelina Grimke had gone far beyond the point where propriety

weighed when it was a question of humanity. She held that 'Whatever is morally right for a man to do is morally right for a woman to do. I recognize no rights but human rights.'"

Great was the distress among the clergy at women who thus defied the ancient Scriptural injunction, thus flying in the face of Providence. Again and again they denounced woman lecturers and quoted Scripture to sustain their claims. They even denounced the women who were bold enough to go to hear a woman lecture!

Maria Weston Chapman wittily responded to one denouncement with a jingle, "The Times That Try Men's Souls," beginning thus:

"Confusion has seized us, and all things go wrong:
The women have leaped from 'their spheres'
And instead of fixed stars, shoot as comets along,
And are setting the world by the ears!"

It was signed by "The Lords of Creation."

The doctrine of "free speech" had long since been declared a human right; but the

women had yet to learn that it was considered to be strictly for men only.

Immediately after the national convention that marked the beginning of the American Anti-slavery Society, in 1833 in Philadelphia, the women of that city formed the Philadelphia Female Anti-slavery Society. In a few years there was a National Society of Anti-slavery Women, and stormy indeed was its history. They found buildings closed against them, churches as well as public halls; they were subjected to insults. One historic meeting was held while the mob raged outside, and missiles and brickbats were hurled through the windows, the noise and confusion drowning the voices of the speakers. The next morning that particular building lay in ruins, sacrificed to the passions of the mob.

In 1839 the women asked to join the National Society of Anti-slavery Men, with the result that the society split in two; one, entirely male, going on its stubborn way, the other joining with the women. So it was that when the call from London came, woman

delegates as well as men were chosen to go, and once more the momentous question of human rights for women became a burning question, and the result was one that could not well have been foreseen.

It was years before Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott carried out the plan they laid in London on the memorable evening when they walked arm-in-arm up Great Queen Street, discussing the rejection of woman delegates from a world convention for the sole crime of being women. It was in 1840 that they first met; it was in 1848 that they made their now famous call to a woman's rights convention.

After noting the effect upon American women of Mary Wollstonecraft's book about woman's rights, it is interesting to note how the radical departure of these women looked to an English woman. This is the woman who became the wife of John Stuart Mill. In an article in the "Westminster Review" of July, 1851, she says:

"Most of our readers will learn from these pages for the first time that there has arisen

in the United States . . . an organized agitation on a new question — new, not to thinkers, not to any one by whom the principles of free and popular government are felt as well as acknowledged, but new, and even unheard of, as a subject for public meetings and practical political action. This question is the enfranchisement of women; their admission in law, and, in fact, to equality in all rights, political, civil, and social, with the male citizens of the country. . . . And it is a movement not only for women, but by them."

The article, "The Enfranchisement of Women," is a masterly one, and must have played a large part in arousing the women of Great Britain to action.

The first woman's rights convention, hastily planned and held at Seneca Falls, N.Y., was an overwhelming success. James Mott was called to the chair, for at that early date they did not dream of putting a woman to preside over a meeting of men and women. A declaration of independence, couched in the language of 1776, was read, approved, and signed by a hundred men and women, but as

the storm of ridicule began to break over the country, many withdrew their names, and thus lost their only chance for immortality.

In all, some twelve resolutions were adopted, among which the following will show the trend of thought:

"Resolved, That woman is man's equal — was intended to be so by the Creator; and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

"Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position; nor their ignorance, by asserting they have all the rights they want.

"Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their right to the elective franchise."

These resolutions, with the declaration of what might be termed the rights and wrongs of women, cover practically all the ground since advocated by the most radical. They asked for equal rights in all things, an equal

standard of morals, and a perfect equality of opportunity in every profession, and the right to a thorough education.

It was small wonder that the whole proceedings were widely published and "unsparingly ridiculed by the press, and denounced by the pulpit." The father of Mrs. Stanton, Judge Cady, immediately journeyed to her in alarm, fearing that her brilliant brain had been turned, and that in some unaccountable way she had been crazed. The convention aroused the whole nation to laughter, and people asked each other what sort of creatures those women at Seneca Falls could be.

So it was that Judge Cady said: "I wish you had waited until I was under the sod before you had done this foolish thing." To which she replied: "Ah! sir, don't you remember how you used to give me law books to read in order that I might have something sensible to say to your friends, Mr. Spencer and Mr. Williams, when they came to dine with us? It was by reading those law books that I found out the injustice of our Amer-

ican laws toward women. I might never have known anything on the subject, except for yourself."

Therefore it was that she could say with authority in the famous declaration:

"He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

"He has taken from her all her right in property, even to the wages she earns.

"He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master; the law giving him power to deprive her of liberty and to administer chastisement."

CHAPTER V

SUSAN B. ANTHONY BECOMES LEADER OF WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT

AMONG those who read the extravagant account of the first woman's rights convention with interest, though not exactly with conviction that they were right in their demands, was one who little thought what the future held for her, or how great a part she was destined to play in succeeding conventions, dedicated to the attainment of human rights for women. Strong, courageous, undaunted, unswerving in her devotion to any ideal on which she set her heart, Susan B. Anthony first began to work for the temperance cause, for not until she was forced to it by the logic of events did she set herself to labor for the cause of woman as a human being.

Brought up a Quaker, the sect which rec-

ognizes the absolute equality of the sexes in human rights, her Quakerism was tinctured by the liberal views of her mother's religion, and she became an uncompromising advocate of liberty. An aunt of hers was a famous preacher; her father believed in equal opportunities for girls and boys; so she never had to struggle against the disapprobation of the home circle. Had it not been for her family's sympathy and encouragement during the years of stress that followed, it is doubtful if she had been strong enough to endure.

It was in the temperance movement that she received her early training. A born organizer, a leader of rare ability, with an immense capacity for work, she tried to do things, and was balked at every turn because she was a woman. In her teaching days she had repeatedly taken a school given up by a man teacher for inefficiency, and found that she could command but one-fourth of his salary, though she gave entire satisfaction. She was present at that convention where Antoinette Brown struggled for three mortal hours to get a hearing;

where she tried to assert her right as a delegate to speak before a mixed audience, even though she was a woman, claiming that women were entitled as human beings to human rights, and failed. These were a few of the things that decided Miss Anthony's course and urged her on to labor for the freedom of her sex.

It was the Woman's Rights movement that threw Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony together, and the world has perhaps never seen another pair like these. Such friendship and such co-partnership will perhaps be duplicated in the future, but it is rare even in the annals of men.

Mrs. Stanton says:

"At this time Miss Anthony's life and mine became nearly one. From my retreat, which I seldom left, being surrounded with a large family of young children, she and I surveyed year after year the State and nation. Whenever we saw work to be done we would together forge our thunderbolts in the form of resolutions, petitions, appeals, and speeches, on every subject — temperance, anti-slavery, woman's rights,

agriculture, education, and religion — uniformly accepting every invitation to go everywhere and do everything. Through all these years Miss Anthony was the connecting link between me and the outer world — the reform scout, who went to see what was going on in the enemy's camp, returning with maps and observations to plan the mode of attack."

No doubt it was the mob spirit, so rampant in the pre-rebellion days, that educated women and made them strong and brave. The greater the opposition, the more they persevered. To further the burning issues of the day — first anti-slavery, then temperance, then woman's rights — they made long journeys, hired halls when they could, held their conventions, wrote and sold literature, and always charged admittance, for in no other way could they have financed their immense undertakings. They were not rich; they gave their lives to their ideals, and surely the laborer is still worthy of his hire!

Usually, though, it was a most precarious wage and they often faced a serious deficit. But they held their meetings, only to have their sessions stampeded by rowdies, or, in

Elizabeth Cady Stanton

the name of religion, balked by stubborn men. Their speeches were interrupted by groans, stamping, and catcalls. The press, with but few exceptions, ridiculed them, *The New York Tribune* being a notable exception, for Horace Greeley was their friend.[1]

Eloquence that would to-day bring a fortune to orator and manager was often buried under indescribable tumult. To quote *The New York Tribune* of September 12, 1853, in a report of a now famous convention, in which Ernestine L. Rose, an eloquent Polish woman, was showing the inequalities of the law:

"The wife dies, and the husband inherits all her property, as is his right, but let the husband die, and the greater part of the property is taken from the wife and given to others, even though all that property was earned or inherited by the wife. She may be turned out of the

[1] He was their friend until after the war. When, during the stormy reconstruction period, they persisted in urging that their claims to citizenship were more pressing than those of the black man, he withdrew the support of his paper from them and their cause. History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, p. 269.

house she was born in and which was hers until marriage, and see it given to her husband's brothers or other kindred, who are strangers to her. I insist that the wife should own and inherit the property of the husband just to the same extent that the husband inherits that of the wife. Why not?"

Answer to the aforesaid: "Hiss-s-s-s-s. Bow-ow-ow."

Another woman is speaking:

"I plead for woman as a mother, that her right to her children be recognized as at least equal to that of the father, and that he being dead, no other can have a right to their guardianship paramount or even equal to hers."

Pantalooned mob as aforesaid: "Oh, dry up! Bow-ow! Waugh! Hiss-s-s-s! Get out!"

Burning with righteous indignation over the inequalities of the law with regard to their sex; striving to find some way out of the injustice that held them down; strangled in mixed audiences and denied their rights as delegates; thwarted even in their own con-

ventions by rowdyism of the lowest kind; ridiculed, satirized, and caricatured by the press of the whole country; scorned often by neighbors and friends, what wonder that some women turned back in terror, while others went forward in redoubled strength, baptized by the fires of persecution, than which there is no stronger force to rouse the truly brave!

A goodly company they were. We of to-day would feel honored by their friendship, but they were often misunderstood by those who looked on. The Grimke sisters, Lucretia Mott, Antoinette Brown, Lucy Stone, Dr. Harriet K. Hunt, Ernestine L. Rose, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Paulina Wright Davis, and many others. As has been said, by many devious ways and paths they at last came into the road marked, "Human Rights for Human Beings."

In their zeal for toleration they opened their platform to any who would talk. They adopted strange reforms and fads for the sake of the principle involved. For the sake of dress reform they endured a martyrdom beside which burning at the stake would be

a cheerful affair, because so soon ended. Miss Anthony said of the so-called Bloomer costume, "I found it a physical comfort, but a mental crucifixion." They saw how women's health was ruined by tight lacing and the weight of the skirts then fashionable; and in their devotion to liberty in any form, they adopted the new and comfortable costume, but after a few years' trial they were obliged to abandon it because of ridicule. The press reviled them; boys hooted, jeered, and stoned them; men stared at them with insolence, and friends scorned them. Who shall say these women were not brave?

These experiences and others decided Miss Anthony that one reform at a time was all that could be carried through successfully. In her weariness she wrote a friend: "Verily I am embarked in an unpopular cause, and must be content to row upstream."

These women were the first militants; gentle, cultured, brave, and strong in their convictions. How naturally they began to do things that at first seemed impossible! But

Susan B. Anthony was perhaps the greatest of them all.

She became convinced by these experiences that the cause of woman was the greatest cause of all, and she flung herself into the movement heart and soul.

She was a miracle of endurance, force, and power. She was press agent, office force, lecturer, organizer. She was financier *par excellence*, being manager and lecturer of her own tours and those of others working in the cause. Well might all women honor her for what she has done for them. She did not start the movement, but she kept it going until it acquired its own irresistible momentum, never to stop until civilization ceases to be.

Thus Susan B. Anthony changed from a "quiet, domestic Quaker maiden into a strong, courageous, uncompromising advocate of absolute equality of rights for women," one of the greatest of her sex, one of the greatest of her race. Had she had the legal power, hers would have been the right, by virtue of earning it, to sign the

emancipation proclamation for one-half of humanity.

Her labors were herculean. In the Winter of 1854–5 she held fifty-four conventions in different counties of the State of New York, with two petitions, one demanding equal property rights, and the other the ballot, and she gathered in by personal exertions some ten thousand names. To get these she went from door to door in many towns, tramping through rain and snow, riding many weary miles over rough roads in wagon or sleigh, going by train when she could, sleeping in strange beds in icy rooms, holding meetings, talking, arguing, discussing, making all the while her own expenses, though often going into debt, to be paid in the next adventure.

In her efforts to secure liberal legislation for women in her own State she was untiring, and scarcely a year passed without petitions, appeals, and addresses before the Legislature. Great was her sorrow and bitter her anger when the New York Legislature took the opportunity, while women were giving themselves body and soul to the labors of war time, to repeal and amend the laws which had

been passed to better the condition of women, sweeping away the labors of ten long, hard years, and reducing women — wives and mothers — to almost the same position as under the old atrocious common law.

Gone was the result of all those weary miles of tramping through rain and snow, through cold and heat; lost all those weary days and nights of talking, arguing, discussing, and entreating in strange towns with strange people, that public sentiment might be aroused for justice; dissipated all the energy which had carried her through that monumental task. Gone also were the labors of the women who had shared some of her toil. Ponder on this, all of you who think the liberties of women are safe in the keeping of the other sex! Reflect on this, all of you who think the chivalry of sex is all-sufficient to guard the rights of those who in the nature of things cannot defend their rights by force of arms!

Nor did these women walk alone. The men who helped them, who attended their conventions, spoke for them and with them,

who aided them in every way, themselves partaking of the ridicule, the ostracism, and the scorn for the sake of a principle in which they believed — human rights for human beings, irrespective of color, sex, or race — were truly great men. Mott, Garrison, Phillips, Channing, Blackwell, Stanton, Frederick Douglass, and others besides — a noble roll-call indeed were they! Together they worked for the various reforms which we today so unheedingly enjoy. The world is freer and more endurable because they saw the light and were true to their ideals.

So it was that the press denounced those gatherings of "strong-minded women" and "weak-minded men." Their meetings were misrepresented, and the women were frequently alluded to as "hyenas," "crowing hens," "cats," "bold wantons," "unsexed females." Small wonder was it that they dreaded to look into the papers, not knowing what next was in store for them, or how their words might be twisted, or the simplest incident magnified out of all proportion, to throw odium on them and on their cause.

Conventions innumerable were called.

Speeches were made to legislatures, petitions circulated, lecture tours planned and carried out, literature sold for propaganda, and the woman movement was launched for better or worse, according to the viewpoint.

Yet slowly they made their way. There were many triumphs won, many heart aches, many compensations. They established the right of free speech for woman; valiantly they earned a place for woman on any and every platform. They grew in eloquence and power. Their meetings were often crowded by respectful audiences, eager to hear a woman speak, if she had anything to say. Their innumerable conventions produced a moral revolution that brought many a blessing to the sex, that opened the way for further reforms, for further triumphs, though the goal upon which they had set their hearts was yet far away.

CHAPTER VI

THE EFFECT OF THE CIVIL WAR AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

IN the sixth century, it is said, at one of the church councils where sixty-nine bishops and over a dozen envoys were gathered, it was gravely discussed whether or not women had souls. The question is said to have arisen this way. One of the bishops objected to having the word *homo* used in connection with a daughter of Eve.

Sanity, however, was restored when his colleagues called his attention to the fact that, according to Genesis "God created man . . . male and female created he them," and also to the fact that the Founder of their faith was called the "Son of Man," although he was recognized as being the Son of Woman. They therefore compromised on allowing woman to be a human being, albeit a

very frail and untrustworthy one. Such, in the current opinion, she remained through the centuries.

The Mohammedans and certain peoples of our own times frankly avow that the only way for a woman to gain immortal life is by entering the married state, it alone fitting her for the hereafter. Not that she then gains an individual existence, for she goes to the abodes of bliss as part of her sovereign lord.

Before you smile an indulgent smile at the folly of bygone philosophers, reflect a little upon the learned discussions that have taken place within the century, in which the highest legal authority of one of the greatest nations on earth expounded the wisdom of the law before the assembled multitudes, the question being a grave and weighty one, worthy the cogitation of the mightiest intellects of the nineteenth century, to wit: Is a woman a person?

This is not exactly the way they discussed it, however, but it was the gist of the argument, for they decided that she was a person, and consumed much valuable time in the

process. Of what use, though (I ask it as a rational creature), of what use is a body of men who will maintain a certain principle to be true, say this year, and three years from now will solemnly declare that the exact opposite is the eternal truth itself? A mere lay-woman is confused by such decisions.

How truly history repeats itself! Some centuries ago philosophers gained great skill in argument by earnestly and gravely discussing how many angels could stand upon the point of a needle at one and the same time. Smile as we will over it, there are other philosophers to assert that we owe some of our own gray matter or some extra convolutions therein, to the mental exercises by which those men developed their brains and passed on to us a finer, keener organ, an inheritance not to be despised.

So possibly, in the far off centuries to come, will arise philosophers who will justify the deliberations of a body of men who are able, by means of mental gymnastics and acrobatic feats of thought, to declare decorously and with great pomp and circumstance that an alien woman, a widow with

an alien son, by virtue of marriage with an American citizen, becomes herself a citizen and confers citizenship automatically upon her minor son, born of a previous marriage in a foreign country, entitling this foreign son, upon arriving at his majority in this country, to become a full fledged citizen of the United States of America — making him a voter by virtue of inheritance through his mother's second marriage!

Here was a foreign-born woman conferring on her foreign-born son a right she herself was not allowed to exercise and which she could not have passed on to a daughter, even though she were born in this wonderful land of freedom. Is this not almost as lucid and limpid as the plot of a comic opera? It seems to be.

But, and if (and this is interesting — almost as interesting as the angel proposition or that of the alien woman and her son) a woman is a citizen by virtue of being born in the United States, and this has been declared (*vide* Fourteenth Amendment), and citizenship be also conferred by marriage with a male citizen, is not an American-born woman,

married to an American-born man, a double citizen? Should she not, by this reasoning, which is every whit as good as Supreme Court reasoning, be entitled to two votes by virtue of her double citizenship?

Yet the Supreme Court would easily find a way out of this difficulty. You see it has been decided already that, while a male citizen can confer citizenship upon the woman he marries, a female citizen can be deprived of her citizenship should she marry a foreigner, for it has been gravely decided that a woman receives citizenship through marriage, assuming her husband's nationality along with his name, her citizenship and her name being alike cancelled automatically by the ceremony. He, being lord and master, king, judge, and jury, and Government personified, endows her with inalienable rights which, upon investigation, prove to be worthless. Truly, the civil law is fearfully and wonderfully made!

It is interesting to note how rapidly civilization moves. The Mohammedans conceded immortality to woman by virtue of marriage.

America graciously confers citizenship in the same romantic way. Thus are the centuries bridged and the chasm spanned betwixt Moslem and Columbia!

To go back to the Supreme Court. There was the Dred Scott case in 1857, in which it was decided that citizens were "the political body, who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty and hold the power, and conduct the Government through their representatives"— a decision which barred out completely some millions of white women and black slaves.

The famous Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, defining for the first time just what citizenship meant. Section 1 declared: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within

its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

A truly splendid charter of human rights, but, alas! it was abridged, nullified, and emasculated by a little word of four letters inserted in the second section. The word was *male*. The United States had broken its own law, done the very thing it forbade the several States to do!

Yet all their authority for all their laws they drew originally from the one and only source of power when they declared in the preamble of their Constitution: "We, the people of the United States, . . . do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." Who are the people? Is it still the world and his wife? If only men are people, what in the name of reason are women? Does it not come back, after all, to this question — to wit: "Is a woman a person?"

Truly it has been said that "a straight line is the shortest distance between two points." Would that this simple proposition could be mastered by the usurpers of our rights!

When they were brought squarely before this question —" if a citizen is a person born in the United States, and if the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and if a woman is a person, being a human being, why cannot that woman exercise the only right which makes her citizenship effective or of any value whatever? "— they answered in this wise:

" The national Constitution does not define the privileges and immunities of a citizen. The United States has no voters of its own creation. The Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one, but the franchise must be regulated by the States. The Fourteenth Amendment does not add to the privileges and immunities of a citizen; it simply furnishes an additional guarantee to protect those he already has. Before the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments the States had power to disfranchise on account of race or color. These Amendments ratified by the State, simply for-

bade that discrimination, but did not forbid that against sex."

It was in 1875 that the court admitted, after due deliberation, that "women are persons and citizens" and dodged the inevitable issue by declaring the foregoing weighty decision. Thus history repeats itself. Once, long ago, they argued whether she had a soul. Within the century they have gravely decided that she is a *person* after all.

Yet, three years before this, when they wished to establish for political purposes the status of the lately freed black man, it was authoritatively announced, "The negro having by the Fourteenth Amendment been declared a citizen of the United States, is thus made a voter in every State in the Union."

From 1848 to 1875 the women in the movement for equal rights grew wise and gradually became steeped in constitutional and legal lore. They had it at their finger-tips; it tripped lightly from their tongues. Grave and weighty legal knowledge enriched their daily conversation and often formed the subject of their correspondence. Moreover,

they knew what they were talking about — at least, they knew as well as anybody did — for to an honest and unprejudiced thinker the decisions made upon this question form a sort of conundrum play to which there is neither point nor answer.

The quibbles by judges and statesmen over the fallacies of their utterly absurd and illogical position, the various changes of base on the equal rights subject, should be relegated to the annals of farce. It would be state comedy were it not so pitifully tragic so far as women are concerned.

Like heroes they toiled. Innumerable conventions they held. They wrote, lectured, sent literature broadcast, and despatched letters by hundreds, letters addressed by hand with pen and ink, with all that that arduous task means. They tramped from door to door with their various petitions, often to have the door slammed in their faces with unkind words from woman's worst enemy — woman. In season and out of season they worked. They travelled thousands of miles, giving up the comforts of home to spread their gospel.

In the early days they had assailed their various legislatures, for in that way had all suffrage extension been achieved. But with the Fourteenth Amendment "Congress lifted the question of suffrage for men above State power and by the amendment prohibited the deprivation of suffrage to any citizen by any State." In the Constitution, therefore, they saw their hope, and that from now on it was a matter of politics.

Their hopes lay with the young and struggling Republican party. In various ways the leading women of the country had allied themselves with it and helped it in many ways. The women, too, had been the most loyal supporters of the anti-slavery party, out of which the Republican party grew, sharing all the odium and the persecution of the early days.

Indeed, it was a woman orator, young, beautiful, and gifted with eloquence and wisdom far beyond her years, who practically won the decisive Republican victory in the hotly contested election of 1862, on which the fate of the Union and the carrying on of the war depended. She aroused tremendous

Anna E. Dickinson

enthusiasm, was hailed as a second Joan of Arc. Men tore off their party badges and wore her likeness instead. Ministers preached about her and prayed for her as a second Maid of Orleans, raised up by God to save the State to the loyal party and through it gain freedom for humanity.

She it was who turned the tide in favor of the freed slave bearing arms in defence of his country, and she it was who broke down the last barriers in the public mind against a woman appearing as a public speaker upon a public platform. Anna Dickinson, while yet in her teens, proved conclusively that eloquence, magnetic power, logic, and all the subtle qualities that move the masses of men by means of the spoken word, do not belong to the male sex alone. At her will she moved her hearers to laughter or to tears, stirred them profoundly by her vivid word pictures of slavery and war, carried them to the heights of enthusiasm by the superb mastery of her art, by her voice, and by her genius.

The Republican party used her and accepted the services of her sisters and yet when they pleaded with their political friends

to strike out the word "male" in the Fourteenth Amendment, they coldly said, "This is the negro's hour."

So these loyal women, performing herculean tasks, enduring ostracism, ridicule, caricature, and scorn for the sake of the slave and for themselves, these women, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, and the host of valiant ones, in spite of all their labors, saw two million black men, ignorant, illiterate, debased by servitude, lifted up above them to become their political superiors and masters.

Their erstwhile friends turned from them — Horace Greeley, Garrison, Phillips, Gerrit Smith, and even Frederick Douglass. "After we have enfranchised the negro we will take up your cause," was the promise they made, a promise which has never been fulfilled.

The women were deceived by both political parties, the Republican and the Democratic, played with, toyed with, and finally cast aside by the exigencies of the hour. Both parties practically said, what is a self-evident truth,

that they had nothing to fear from the women, but inferred that they feared the negro.

They argued eloquently about safeguarding the rights of the black man, but never a word did they say about safeguarding the rights of the black woman and her white sister. They passed the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, the two last bearing to this day the little joker which they wilfully and unchivalrously inserted to disfranchise one-half the people, those who have the greatest need of political power, because in the nature of things they cannot fight those who have usurped their rights.

There is absolutely no reason why women should revere the Constitution. The safeguard of man's rights, it has been a veritable Chinese wall through which women cannot break and over which they cannot climb. "We, the people," says its preamble. What irony! What mockery! "We, the people!" It is chicanery, pure and simple, to count the whole people as a basis of power, to tax the whole people, to judge the whole

people, and then to make an accident of birth the sole prerogative of power!

For surely maleness and femaleness are as yet accidents of birth, the mystery of which has never yet been solved. Perchance a male spirit dwelt in Joan of Arc, then in some brawny form must have dwelt a spirit feminine. But in the realm of spirit, as in the realm of mind, there is no sex, no limitation!

The negro, raised to power, followed the example of his newfound peers and used his influence to keep in subjection the noble women who had labored with might and main to set him free. It is barely possible that there is nothing heroic about writing a story, and yet if a story serves a noble purpose surely the writing thereof becomes a noble deed.

Harriet Beecher Stowe, struggling with her household cares, carrying the white woman's burden in a home not too bountifully supplied, found time between whiles and after the day's work was done to pen the tale that thrilled the world and crystallized the sentiment against slavery. Yet Harriet Beecher Stowe lived and died a political serf,

the sentiment against her being some two million stronger by virtue of the very men she herself had helped to free.

The Civil War was but a repetition of the Revolution. The women on both sides threw themselves heart and soul into the strife and did women's work as well as men's to further the cause in which they believed. Again, they ploughed, and sowed, and reaped; took care of the business, paid taxes. They cared for the children, looked after the homes, sewed for the soldiers, sacrificed for them. They gave up their sons, husbands, fathers, brothers, sweethearts; and some of them, no doubt, masculine spirits in feminine bodies, thirsting for the glories of war, disguised their womanhood and actually fought, all unknown, side by side with the men until death or some accident betrayed their sex.

As for women's services, it was Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, the first woman doctor of England and America to secure a degree, who organized the society of women which later developed into the famous sanitary commission, through which was raised voluntarily

the enormous sum of ninety-two million dollars to aid the sick and wounded of the army.

It is said that the uprising was no more general among men than among women. For every organization of men to further the cause there was one of women. They worked unselfishly, these women, unpaid, with all the precision and intensity of organized paid labor. They gave their services with no thought of salary or pension.

There was Clara Barton, who was ever within the firing line, whose dress was riddled by bullets and sometimes torn by shells, and yet who never forsook her place. To her there was neither friend nor foe. They were just boys and men, poor, wounded, mangled pieces of humanity, and she nursed them all alike, though they tried in vain to persuade her that the only ones who were worthy of her care were the boys in blue.

A new code of war ethics came into the civilized world through woman's tenderness, for since the time of Florence Nightingale in the Crimea and Clara Barton in America there has ceased to be friend or foe in rescue work. In time, mayhap, humanity will rebel against

Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell

binding up the wounds of tortured men, of raising men at infinite cost only to shatter them wholesale, to feed quivering flesh to cannon; rebel against all this on the ground that it is too costly a method of settling mere differences of opinion, differences which in a real civilization could be settled at the ballot box.

Women gave their services freely in hospital and on the field. It is perhaps not too much to say that in every department, in every avenue, women proved themselves loyal people and efficient ones, worthy to have an honored place, a status commensurate even with that of men, the status of a common citizenship, to count one not only in the census and on the tax list but to count one at the polls.

Not only as nurses, spies, messengers, or disguised as soldiers did women prove their worth. It is conceded and has been reluctantly admitted that to a woman's brain is due the plans that practically turned the tide of the war and made the Union safe. The war department had settled on a definite plan

of sending a fleet of gunboats down the Mississippi, but changed their plans in favor of one offered by a woman, Anna Ella Carroll, who, had she been a man, would long since have been extolled as a national hero.

Because she was a woman and a civilian, the utmost secrecy was necessary, but her plan was carried out, the plan of making the Tennessee River, instead of the Mississippi, the base of military operations in the West. She gave the detailed plan and supplied the explanatory maps and succeeded in convincing not only the President but his cabinet, who "feared to reveal the fact that the Government was proceeding under the advice and plan of a civilian, and that civilian a woman."

It is conceded by all the historians of the Civil War that the strategy which made the Tennessee River the base of military operations in 1862, thus gaining the control of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad and cutting the Confederacy in two, made its final destruction inevitable. But for Miss Carroll's timely help, a fatal military blunder

would have been made, and the course of our history entirely changed.

Years later, while General Grant was reaping the favors of fame and the news of President Garfield's assassination was being cabled across the world, this woman lay dying in obscurity, unnoticed by her Government or the nation she had helped to save. But for her Grant's genius might have been all in vain, and Garfield might never have risen from his humble place. It is not that one would wish less fame for these honored men, but that some of the glory might be allowed to rest upon those who earn it, even though it be a woman presumptuous enough to dictate successfully and wisely the strategy by which a great war can be carried on to victory.

Miss Carroll's claim to be a military strategist of the highest order is sufficiently attested, yet the fact has never been allowed to creep into men's histories of the war. Instead they glorify the making of a flag, the sewing together of a few pieces of bunting as woman's share in the great struggles for liberty. They make liberty in the guise of a woman ideal and deny it to her whom liberty

represents. Who cannot be brave and strong, and wise and famous when all competition is eliminated by force?

It is time for our school histories to be revised; for if women can thus rise to the heights of devotion and loyalty without the inspiration of ambition furthered by heroine worship, who can say to what heights they might not rise were their imaginations fired by records of the past wherein women figured as heroines, even as boys rise through hero-worship?

The war over, all the devotion, all the labor that the women gave through those four long and tragic years were again forgotten, even as in the days of the Revolution. The Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments were passed and the nation, fresh from its baptism of blood, dedicated anew to human rights, ignored the claim of half its people and went on its stubborn way a male autocracy, a sex aristocracy, yet boasting to be the land of freedom and liberty, boasting to be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The Constitution is still a Chinese wall,

over which the women people cannot climb and through which they cannot break. It is called the bulwark of liberty, and draws all its powers from its only source, boldly commencing, "We, the people, . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Hope should not be abandoned, however, until it be enacted that a little word of three letters be inserted there, making the historic document read like this: "We, the men people, . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution."

CHAPTER VII

THE WOMEN GIVE UP THEIR CAUSE TO FURTHER THAT OF THE SLAVE

IT was the third year of the war. A vast audience of women of all ages and conditions filled to overflowing a certain famous church in New York City, and in solemn conclave adopted this resolution: —

"We, loyal women of the nation, assembled in convention this fourteenth day of May, 1863, hereby pledge ourselves one to another in a loyal league, to give support to the Government in so far as it makes a war for freedom."

"A war for freedom!" That was their keynote, for from early days the women leaders had made common cause with the black slaves on the Southern plantations, recognizing plainly that they had many grievances in common.

The Emancipation Proclamation had been issued, and while it broke the strength of slavery, it neither secured negroes in their liberty, nor gave it to all of them. Only by an act of Congress, by an amendment to the Constitution, could this be done. The Abolitionists were eager to complete the freedom of the down-trodden race for which they had labored thirty years, but there seemed to be a wide-spread feeling that this should not be made a war for the negro. Apparently the issue at stake was the principle of State Rights, the right of a State to settle its own affairs, to be a sovereign State, without regard to a central authority.

The North, therefore, was fighting for the Union; the South for a Confederacy. The great mass of the people did not see, nor did all the leaders, that back of the principle of State sovereignty there stood the great force of an abominable institution, and that but for slavery, there might never have arisen the difference of opinion about whether this was a union, indestructible and compact, or whether it was a loose confederacy of independent States.

The days were dark with foreboding, the fortunes of war by no means assured. Until the seceded States should have proved their independence they were virtually bound by the laws of the Union if, at this critical time, the central Government could enforce them. The proclamation had been made. If only the freedom of the blacks could be legally assured, there was hope that slavery might be abolished forever in America, and the war brought to a close.

Pressure, therefore, must be brought to bear upon Congress to abolish slavery. Public opinion must be aroused against traffic in human flesh, and no way has yet been devised quite so effective to accomplish both ends, as the time-honored method of petitions. Who so skilful, who so practised in this laborious art as Susan B. Anthony? For two score years she had been at such work, exercising unceasingly this, her sole right under the Government, though ever praying by means of it, to be endowed with the more potent right of direct power. To her, therefore, came the request to take up this tremendous work. The result was a call

to women to assemble in a convention, and the Loyal League was then and there inaugurated, its chief object to gather in, if possible, one million petitions praying Congress to abolish slavery forever from the entire land.

Miss Anthony was one of those women who must have a cause for which to labor. To her great grief the Woman Movement, by common consent, had been abandoned since the beginning of the war. The others argued that it would be sacrilege to press their question when the Government was in such distress, when the Nation was plunged in deadly conflict. They insisted that the war was the great question, and that if they would but help the Government in its struggle, when peace was again restored the grateful Government would at last reward them. They had yet to learn the ways of governments.

Thus two years passed in inactivity so far as the Woman Movement was concerned. In both years Miss Anthony tried to hold conventions as of yore, but no one would as-

sist her. As for herself, never would she acknowledge that there was or could be a greater or more important question than the one concerning the freedom of one-half the race.[1] Perhaps she was right.

It was a bitter disappointment, nevertheless, that her co-workers would let other questions take precedence over that of the status of their sex. She felt that they were in danger of losing all that had been gained in former years. She felt that when the war was at an end, their question of rights would be overwhelmed by the multitude of other problems then to be solved. Time justified her wisdom and proved that she had reasoned aright. Thus it was that she had consented to give her energy, time, and strength to the cause of slavery alone, and the great convention in the New York church was the first result.

Subsequently it was decided that the work of the League should be confined entirely to the labor of getting the petitions signed asking Congress to abolish slavery absolutely.

[1] Life of Susan Brownell Anthony. Husted-Harper. Vol. I, p. 218.

To this end petitions must be circulated and signatures obtained from all parts of the country. It meant raising hundreds, perhaps thousands of dollars; it meant thousands of workers for a house-to-house canvass in every city, village, and hamlet in the land; it meant meetings with speakers to persuade the unconvinced; it meant such a campaign for educating and arousing public opinion as should force Congress to heed at once their demand.

It was characteristic of Miss Anthony that without a dollar or the guarantee of one she commenced her tremendous labors. She opened up headquarters in Cooper Institute. Thousands of petitions were prepared and sent out and with them the following letter: —

"The Women's National League to The Women of the Republic: We ask you to sign and circulate this petition for the entire abolition of slavery. Remember the President's proclamation reaches only the slaves of Rebels. The jails of loyal Kentucky are to-day filled with Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama slaves,

advertised to be sold for their jail fees 'according to the law,' precisely as before the war! While slavery exists anywhere there can be freedom nowhere. There must be a law abolishing slavery. We have undertaken to canvass the nation for freedom. Women, you cannot vote nor fight for your country. Your only way to be a power in the Government is through the exercise of this one sacred, constitutional 'right of petition'; and we ask you to use it now to the utmost. Go to the rich, the poor, the high, the low, the soldier, the civilian, the white, the black; gather up the names of all who hate slavery, all who love liberty, and would have it in the law of the land, and lay them at the feet of Congress, your silent but potent vote for human freedom guarded by law."

With office rent, clerk hire, printing, postage, and all the usual items of a big undertaking, expenses were heavy, amounting in all to five thousand dollars for the eighteen months' campaign. Some three thousand dollars of this amount was raised by the expedient of asking every one who signed his name to give one cent; and in those dark days of disaster and depreciated currency, every

penny counted with the mass of the people. The remainder of the debt was made up by voluntary contributions and from the profits of a series of lectures given at Cooper Institute; yet when the Loyal League finally disbanded, there was still a small deficit which Miss Anthony, as secretary, paid out of her own slender earnings.

Many gave willingly of their time and strength to help this work. Lecturers were sent out to educate the people on the subject of human rights, and every available person was pushed into the field of service. The result was four hundred thousand names, the largest petition that had ever yet been gathered in. As the petitions came in from all over the country, statesmen like Sumner and Wilson grew eloquent in praising women for their loyalty. With this tangible evidence of wide-spread public opinion, statesmen had the courage of their opinions and could safely urge suitable legislation to complete the freedom of the slave.

Women who, when pressing their own claims had been denounced as "fanatical," "imprudent," "impractical," by the press,

were now praised for their patience, executive ability, and patriotism. As the "History of Woman Suffrage" says:

"During the six years they held their own claims in abeyance to the slaves of the South, and labored to inspire people with enthusiasm for the great measures of the Republican party, they were highly honored as 'wise, loyal and clear-sighted.' But again when the slaves were emancipated and they asked that women should be recognized in the reconstruction as citizens of the Republic, equal before the law, all these transcendent virtues vanished like dew before the morning sun. And thus it ever is: so long as woman labors to second man's endeavors and exalt his sex above her own, her virtues pass unquestioned; but when she dares to demand rights and privileges for herself, her motives, manners, dress, personal appearance, character, are subjects for ridicule and detraction." [1]

The moral effect of such a huge petition, of the wide-spread agitation against the sin of slavery, uprooting as it did the idea of

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, p. 51.

property in human flesh, can scarcely be overestimated. Before the petitions ceased coming in, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution was passed. The work was done.

If any person in the United States missed getting a legal education during the years from 1861 to 1870 it certainly was his own fault. Such a schooling in the principles of government, in the fundamental law of the land, in the broad principles of human freedom, had never perhaps come to any people, and may never come again.

No longer were such questions academic, or mere idle problems to be used for idle discussion, for they were found to be vital issues for which men were willing to give up their lives, if need were. The nation had been plunged into war because of them. Few firesides were so humble or so obscure as to evade these problems, and but few families escaped paying toll in blood and tears to settle these differences of opinion. So it came about that there was an intellectual awaken-

ing in matters governmental, in fundamental principles, such as seldom comes to any people.

Meanwhile, there were enacted in the Southern States many laws and provisions that served to hamper and needlessly harass the freedmen. To this situation were added all the economic, industrial, and social problems attendant upon suddenly throwing upon their own resources a large population of ignorant and irresponsible slaves.

It was chaos. Meantime the many conflicting theories, the legal, financial, economic, and social problems were pressing upon the people and upon Congress for solution. The majority of the population have "the legal habit of mind" and were anxious to abide by their fundamental law, the Constitution. What provision was there in the venerated instrument for such a tremendous crisis as this? What did the Constitution mean?

These were some of the questions that the people asked, and neither the President nor Congress could answer them.

Not alone upon the men did these prob-

lems press, but upon the women as well. There had been great changes in economic, social, and industrial conditions among them, as must necessarily be the case in every great war. While men are away fighting, or when they die or are killed, the women dependent upon such as these must of necessity meet the changed conditions. These changes had to be met by women in the North as well as in the South.

Thus if there was chaos during the war, there was if possible greater chaos when it was over. In a great crisis people go on and adjust themselves unconsciously to conditions as they are; after the crisis there comes the real test of strength and endurance. Such a test was in store for the American people. The women, especially, were to learn of the ways and the gratitude of governments, to learn what chance their unpopular cause stood among the host of grievances and differences to be settled, the problems to be solved.

So it was that the women contending for political rights, became adepts in Constitutional lore. Long years of training had pre-

pared them to grasp the legal problems now before the people. They knew their Constitution by heart; they were wise in law and governmental problems, if not in the ways of men.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WOMAN'S WAR BEGINS AGAIN: YEARS 1865–68

PERHAPS in the future there will rise a poet who will put into immortal verse the efforts of the self-elected commander-in-chief of the woman's forces, as she gathered up her former allies and inspired them once again to earnest and concerted action. Not that there was aught that was dramatic or picturesque, for the woman herself was too practical to do anything that was not in itself practical, but that there was a fine unselfishness displayed, a disregard of self in the splendid efforts she put forth that would have appalled the ordinary woman. However, the woman who elected herself as the leader of her sex was far from ordinary.

Deprived for the time being of any great cause for which to work, Susan B. Anthony

had gone to Kansas for a visit and a rest, if she could find it. While reading the daily papers one afternoon, she came across a news item that galvanized her into instant action. She started East at once, though she broke her journey at many places to lecture, as was her wont, upon the subjects that lay near her heart. To understand this woman, you must conceive of her as a public teacher, who never missed an opportunity to give an oral lesson. Like many another reformer she was a professor in the University of Life and she met her classes where she could.

Once in the Eastern States, she began to gather up her allies. From her home in Rochester, N. Y., she hurried toward the East to fulfil her mission. At Auburn she conferred with old friends but they were dubious and cautious. Then on she went to her always faithful ally, her life co-partner, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, whom she never found wanting when the real test came. They spent much of the night talking and making plans, and next morning she started "bright and early on that mission which she was to

follow faithfully and steadfastly, without cessation or turning aside, for the next thirty years" to —.[1] But wait a moment.

So grave was the danger that threatened, so far-reaching the consequences if the danger were not met or averted, that she dared not trust at first to the cold formality of business-like letters, but must herself in person fan into a blaze the smoldering embers that once burned so fiercely in the hearts of her old companions in the cause. She knew where to find many of them — Phœbe Jones and Lydia Mott were in Albany, N. Y.; Lucy Stone and Antoinette Blackwell were in New Jersey; Stephen and Abby Foster were in Worcester, Massachusetts; Mrs. Severance, Mrs. Dall, Mrs. Nowell, Mr. Phillipps, Mr. Garrison, and Dr. Harriot K. Hunt were in Boston and must be seen. In Concord she met Emerson, Alcott, and others of that famous coterie, and was assured of their sympathy and support.

In Philadelphia she found James and Lu-

[1] Life of Susan Brownell Anthony. Husted-Harper. Vol. I, p. 252.

cretia Mott, Mary Grew, and Sarah Pugh, and was able to interest other friends in the City of Brotherly Love. Then she went back to New York City. There her days were spent in hunting up old friends, Paulina Wright Davis, Theodore Tilton, Henry Ward Beecher, and all that could be found, arousing them anew to energy and action. Her evenings were spent with Mrs. Stanton preparing for the coming battle. So were the old-time valiant contenders for equal rights won back; all the old-time friends were thus aroused.

Concerning this time her diary briefly says: "Returned to New York and commenced work in earnest. Spent nearly all the Christmas holidays addressing and sending out petitions." With Mrs. Stanton and others, hundreds of letters were mailed to far-distant friends in every part of the country, for the war in which they were engaged was not to be a local battle, nor was the danger limited to the few. It was limited only by the boundaries of our nation, and might seriously affect millions of people of their time and millions more in the years to come.

What meant all this activity? What was the mission for which she labored so mightily, that sent her with untiring energy from city to city and from friend to friend? What was the news item that roused her to such untiring action, such devoted exertion?

It would have passed unnoticed, perhaps, or at least been considered uninteresting by the ordinary reader; but her mind saw at once the far-reaching effects of the danger that threatened. It was this. There was actually a proposition before the Congress of these United States of America, this great free land, to put the word *male* into the Constitution, as the basis for the right of suffrage. A Fourteenth Amendment was under consideration, the first two sections reading as follows: —

Article XIV, Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or

property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of its laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be appointed among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of President and Vice-President of the United States, representatives in Congress, the executive or judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the *male* inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such *male* citizens shall bear to the whole number of *male* citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

In Congress meantime, there was burning eloquence. Republican members were saying over and over again that "suffrage is a natural right and belongs to every citizen who pays taxes and helps to support the State." They recalled to life the fundamental princi-

ples of our Government and quoted the arguments which the early fathers had used to convince themselves and others when they were seeking freedom from the mother country. The ballot, it was declared, was the only weapon by which one class could protect itself against the aggressions of another class. Said the great Charles Sumner in one of his flights of oratory: "The Ballot is the Columbiad of our political life, and every citizen who holds it is a full-armed Monitor." [1]

In the midst of all this eloquence, all this resurrecting of old-time vital principles, there came rolling in from many States hundreds of petitions from loyal women asking and praying that the Congress of this great free land would make an amendment to "*prohibit the several States from disfranchising any of their citizens on the ground of sex.*" It was an eloquent appeal, asking justice for fifteen million "intelligent, virtuous, native-born American citizens," one-half the adult population of the country. They further asked that "in order to sim-

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, p. 168.

plify the machinery of Government and ensure domestic tranquillity, that you legislate hereafter for persons, citizens, tax-payers, and not for class or caste. For justice and equality your petitioners will ever pray."

Consternation! Confusion! The generals in charge of the national law-making forces had forgotten that Susan B. Anthony and her faithful aide-de-camp, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, still lived!

Though they had gone into the work again as into a battle royal, the women did not dream of the dismay and apprehension that their petitions would bring. Had they thrown bombs, real missiles of warfare, it might have been more comfortable for the Republican leaders. Like boomerangs, their words had come back upon them. The women had taken their arguments at face value, as actual truths!

Strangely enough the loyal women found that a petition circulated to further the plans of men won for them great praise, extended press notices; they were called loyal, patriotic; but a petition circulated to further their own plans brought down upon them bitter

denunciations, and even the disapproval of their former stanch allies, the men who had always before been keenly interested in the struggle for equal rights. Charles Sumner, after having flooded the Senate with his oratory in favor of justice, after having appealed to the basic principles of righteous government, after having given expressions of gratitude to the Loyal League for furnishing him with "ammunition for our speeches," was guilty of presenting a petition from the women of his own State headed by Lydia Maria Child, with the remark that the whole thing was "most inopportune"!

So it was proved that in spite of all their eloquence, the attempt to enfranchise the male negro was not a virtuous attempt to do justice to a down-trodden race, but an attempt to gain recruits for the Republican party. The Republican party wanted votes far more than it wanted justice. It wanted to control the South, as it had controlled the North, and it was a foregone conclusion that every negro would vote for the party which made his freedom possible. They could count upon the male negroes as so many re-

cruits, while the white women were an unknown quantity.

Had all their high-sounding arguments been true, had they really wanted to do justice to a down-trodden race, they would have endowed the females as well as the males, for surely one sex was as deeply sunk in ignorance and degradation as the other, and if the one needed the ballot, the other surely did. Had they really felt inclined to do justice, and had they wanted to protect the class that really needed protection from the aggressions of other classes, they would then have enfranchised the black women of the South, instead of the black men. As it was, these colored women soon found that instead of a white master they now had a black one.

It was early suggested that the word "persons" be put in the proposed Amendment instead of "males." "That would never do," answered another statesman, "it would enfranchise all the Southern wenches."

Then began the mock battle in Congress. Some notice had to be taken of the petitions that flooded the national assembly. Acres of words to dodge the inevitable question, the

Lucy Stone

logical conclusion of all their eloquence; acres of words to indulge in fulsome flattery where only justice was needed, to make a brilliant sally, to gain time, to parry the question, but there was little to the point. Those who championed the cause of women were accused of doing so only in order to defeat negro suffrage, not to further woman suffrage.

Some men believed in the absolute equality of rights as a theoretical proposition, but that it was not practical nor expedient at this time. Three days they consumed discussing whether or not they should make an experiment of universal suffrage in the little District of Columbia, but were afraid to try it, perhaps for fear that it might be too successful.

They were willing enough, though, it afterwards proved, to experiment with some two million ignorant, debased, and illiterate black men fresh from slavery. There were some able champions of women in the last debate, Senators Cowan, Anthony, Brown, and Wade. They did excellent service, pleading that the Nation first make the experiment with fifteen million intelligent,

virtuous, and loyal women, before experimenting with a mass of ignorance and illiteracy.

The labors of the pioneer women and the unanswerable arguments of John Stuart Mill in his "On the Subjection of Women" had begun to bear fruit in broader ideas among the few, in a growing conception that to be a human being should entitle that being to all human rights without reservation.

There was little doubt that the self-elected commander-in-chief had aroused her forces. The year 1866 saw the organization of the American Equal Rights Society, a merging of the Woman's Rights Society with part of the old Anti-Slavery Society. It happened that the same persons were identified with both organizations. They usually held their anniversary conventions during the same week and at the same place. There was some opposition to the combination, but in the main it was held that as Congress was considering the advisability of bestowing citizenship upon male negroes, and as women were demanding the same right, by merging the

two societies into one there would be a saving of labor and time, in that the same conventions, petitions, and appeals would serve both the disfranchised classes.

The preamble to the constitution of the American Equal Rights Society, drawn up by the first Woman's Rights convention called after the war in May, 1866, explains how it all came about, while Article 2 explains the object of the new society.

Preamble. Whereas, by the war, society is once more resolved into its original elements, and in the reconstruction of our Government we again stand face to face with the broad question of natural rights, all associations based on special claims for special classes are too narrow and partial for the hour. Therefore, from the baptism of this second Revolution, purified and exalted through suffering, seeing with a holier vision that the peace, prosperity, and perpetuity of the Republic rests on Equal Rights to All, we, to-day, assembled in our eleventh National Woman's Rights Convention, bury the woman in the citizen, and our organization in that of the American Equal Rights Association.

Article 2. The object of this Association

shall be to secure Equal Rights to all American citizens, especially the right of suffrage, irrespective of race, color, or sex.[1]

The Woman's War was on. The year 1867 saw a Constitutional Convention in New York, a Commission in Michigan, and in Kansas the astounding proposal to submit the question of votes for women and votes for freedmen to a vote of her white male people. In New York the race question was far removed, they saw it from afar. They could judge of it on intellectual grounds, apart from prejudice. It seemed only fair to give the colored *man* a right to protect himself. But the woman question was different, somehow. Women they saw every day. This question was near to them. Could it be that they were prejudiced?

A Constitutional Convention! It was the first time such a chance had come to them since the beginning of their movement, and they planned an elaborate campaign, beginning in January. There was much to do.

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, p. 173.

They must appeal to the whole people, men and women alike, to educate the men to want to give justice and to instruct the women to demand it. For three months a band of their best speakers — the Rev. Olympia Brown, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, Henry Blackwell, Frederick Douglass, Parker Pillsbury, and others, held conventions in all the chief cities of the State, pleading with eloquence and logic for equal rights to all, arousing public opinion upon the subject of human rights.

It was Mrs. Stanton who bombarded the Legislature. No sooner had the Constitutional Convention been called, than she appeared before the State Assembly, asking not only that the word "male" be stricken from their Constitution but asking also that to women be given the power to vote for members of that Convention, which was to be held in June. A large and brilliant audience greeted her, members of the Legislature, lawyers, judges, and women of wealth and fashion. As usual with her, law, history, logic, eloquence, and satire made up the burden of her speech. That law-makers are

not easily moved by facts, common sense, or reason is easily inferred, for her request was not granted.[1]

In March came the thrilling news that the Legislature of Kansas had decided to submit the amazing yet just proposition to her white male people that the words "male" and "white" both be stricken out of their Constitution. Practically this amounted to a proposition for universal suffrage, perhaps the first ever submitted to any people. It was immediately decided that every effort must be made, every nerve strained if need be, to carry the amendment to strike out the word "male," but standing as they did for equal rights to all, they must make it a double campaign not only for white women, but for the negro, male and female.

From an available source they received fifteen hundred dollars to begin work. Lucy Stone and Henry Blackwell [2] were persuaded

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, p. 271.

[2] Henry B. Blackwell and Lucy Stone were husband and wife. Mrs. Stone, as she was called, re-

to open up the campaign, as the other speakers were busy with preparations for the coming New York Constitutional Convention. An extract from a letter from Henry Blackwell gives a fair idea of what striving for the unpopular cause of suffrage meant to those early fighters.

"DEAR FRIENDS, E. C. STANTON AND SUSAN B. ANTHONY:

"You will be glad to know that Lucy and I are going over the length and breadth of this State, speaking every day, and sometimes twice, journeying from twenty-five to forty miles daily, sometimes in a carriage and sometimes in an open wagon with or without springs. We climb hills and dash down ravines, ford creeks, and ferry over rivers, rattle across limestone ledges, struggle through muddy bottoms, fight the high winds on the rolling prairies, and address the most astonishing (and most astonished) audiences in the most extraordinary places. To-night it may be a schoolhouse, to-morrow a stone church; next day a store with planks for

fused to lose her identity in marriage by taking her husband's name. He held the same view. Consequently they were known as Mr. Blackwell and Mrs. Stone.

seats; and in one place, if it had not rained, we should have held forth in an unfinished court-house, with only four stone walls but with no roof whatever.

"The people are a queer mixture of roughness and intelligence, recklessness and conservatism. One swears at women who want to wear the breeches; another wonders if we ever heard of a fellow named Paul; a third is not going to put women on an equality with niggers. One woman told Lucy that no decent woman would be running over the country talking nigger and woman. Her brother told Lucy that 'he had a woman under the sod, but that if she had ever said that she wanted to vote he would have pounded her to death!'

" . . . Our meetings are doing much toward organizing and concentrating public sentiment in our favor, and the papers are beginning to show front in our favor. . . . I think we shall probably succeed in Kansas next fall if the State is thoroughly canvassed, not else. . . . We must have Mrs. Stanton, Susan, Mrs. Gage, and Anna Dickinson this fall. Also Ben Wade and Carl Schurz, if possible. We must also try to get ten thousand each of Mrs. Stanton's address, of Lucy Stone's address, and of Mrs. Mill's article on the 'En-

franchisement of Women,' printed for us from the Hovey Fund.[1]

"Kansas is to be *the battle ground* for 1867. *It must not be allowed to fail.* The politicians here, except Wood and Robinson, are generally on the fence. But they dare not oppose us openly. And the Democrat leaders are quite disposed to take us up. If the Republicans come out against us the Democrats will take us up. Do not let anything prevent your being here September 1, *for the campaign,* which will end in November. There will be a big fight and a great excitement.

"Yours truly,
"HENRY B. BLACKWELL."

Kansas was a new State. It was raw and crude, as any country is likely to be in its early days. White immigrants were pouring in to find new homes on the frontier, and negroes were pouring in from Southern States. Everything was in the formative stage. The people were open to new ideas, as people are likely to be in new communities. To the surprise of the woman leaders, how-

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. I, pp. 857–8, 667.

ever, the Eastern press, from which the Kansas press quite naturally took its tone, was strangely silent as to the woman's cause. They had counted much on Greeley and his *New York Tribune*, Theodore Tilton and his *Independent*, and Wendell Phillips of *The Anti-slavery Standard;* but they were silent.[1]

Meantime the battle in New York went on. The regular May convention was held, petitions were circulated and preparations made for the hearing before the Constitutional Convention in June. Though twenty-eight thousand petitions were presented asking that the Constitution be so amended that the right of franchise might be secured to the women of New York, it was all in vain. Yet there are people who still claim that society is far removed from that stage where "might makes right."

Their defeat was due to the Republican party. Negro suffrage was a part of their party platform, and as the fight wore on they became panic-stricken lest the efforts of the women to secure their own right might jeopardize the success of the party and

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, p. 230.

defeat the negro suffrage amendment. In Kansas especially, much pressure was brought to bear by the Eastern leaders upon the local leaders, and the party whip was swung over the adherents. Men violently opposed to woman suffrage stumped the State in opposition to the equal rights forces, arousing most intense feeling.

Later came Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton and the Hutchinson family of singers, Miss Anthony bringing with her sixty thousand tracts, for the buying and printing of which she had tramped up and down Broadway under the blazing July sun, "soliciting advertisements for the fly leaves of the new literature she meant to have printed." [1]

The treasury was empty, but she managed to raise some money and found her way with her ally to the battle ground, armed with her tracts.

"Our tracts are more than half the battle," she wrote; "reading matter is so very scarce that everybody clutches at any kind of a book"; then follows an order for more.

[1] Life of Susan Brownell Anthony. Husted-Harper. Vol. I, p. 282.

"Send me two thousand Curtis's speeches; two thousand of Beecher's; one thousand of each of the others."

As the battle of words grew more strenuous and bitter, the arguments of the Republicans began to sound strange to many of the men, who looked at their wives and daughters, mothers and sisters, intelligent, law-abiding, virtuous women, bearing equally with them the burdens and privations necessary to subdue a new, raw country; and then looked at the illiterate, ignorant, and often degraded freedman, fresh from a debasing slavery, and declared, "If our women cannot vote, then the negro shall not."

It was then that the faithless Republican leaders, becoming fearful lest their precious negro amendment might be lost in Kansas and realizing at last that their opposition to woman suffrage was doing damage to negro suffrage, published an appeal in *The New York Tribune*, for the benefit of Kansas alone, as the other campaigns for women were over and lost.

"To the Voters of the United States:

"In this hour of national reconstruction we appeal to the good men of all parties, to Conventions for amending State Constitutions, to the Legislatures of every State, and to the Congress of the United States, to apply the principles of the Declaration of Independence to women; 'Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.' The only form of consent recognized under a Republic is suffrage. Mere tacit acquiescence is not consent; if it were, every despotism might claim that its power is justly held. Suffrage is the right of every adult citizen, irrespective of sex or color. Women are governed, therefore they are rightly entitled to vote.

"The problem of American statesmanship is how to incorporate in our institutions a guarantee of the rights of every individual. The solution is easy. Base government on the consent of the governed, and each class will protect itself."

This was signed by some of the most influential men of the nation, including the former friends of the woman cause, the ones who had so traitorously abandoned it in its

hour of need,— Beecher, Gerritt Smith, Curtis, Garrison, Phillips, and Higginson.

The women had made a brave fight. They were unsupported by any influential paper; rather had the press opposed them in every way, throwing all its influence in favor of negro suffrage and against woman suffrage, or else opposing both. The whole Republican party threw its weight against them; unscrupulous politicians fought them openly. Both amendments were lost in Kansas; and yet, in spite of all the opposition, they polled about the same number of votes — a little over nine thousand for woman suffrage and more than ten thousand for negro suffrage.

Thus ended the great campaigns. The Fourteenth Amendment finally passed, and in its ratification it was proclaimed to the ages yet to come that America had no really great statesman, no man big enough to make himself immortal by insisting upon justice, come what would. America had no John Stuart Mill to plead for her daughters, no Jacob Bright to take away their reproach.

CHAPTER IX

THE GREATEST OF POLITICAL CRIMES

EXCEPT as a mental exercise, or as furnishing material for brain gymnastics, one can have but little respect for law or legal training after wading through the hundreds of pages of legal and political discussions that led up to and followed the enactment of the greatest political crime that the world has ever seen, namely the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, July 28, 1868, designed as it was, with special malignity, to bar out completely from their inherent rights millions upon millions of loyal, virtuous, and trustworthy citizens, who, in the nature of things can not establish their claims by force of arms. It was a cowardly, dastardly act. As for the statesmanship that triumphed then, what shall be said of it, save that when real justice reigns, it will no longer be honored?

Until July 28, 1868, there was nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent women from exercising their full rights, though every State Constitution [1] had carefully put up the bars, so that no one was eligible to exercise the franchise except white males over twenty-one years of age. This barrier still exists, save that the Fourteenth Amendment, according to the highest legal authority, nullified automatically the word "white" in every State Constitution, thus making adult *maleness* the sole requisite for full citizenship.

Though there was nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent women from voting, the Constitutions of the several States effectually barred them out. Of this fact men, politicians, and statesmen were fully aware. It should be to the everlasting dishonor of the statesmen of that time, and to the men who were guilty of participation in the nefarious scheme, that party expediency was allowed to triumph over honest conviction and over justice itself. As for Sumner,

[1] New Jersey was an exception to this rule at first. See History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. III, p. 476. Also Vol. I, p. 447.

the statesman was swallowed up by the politician, and Sumner missed his chance for immortality. Had he chosen righteousness instead of expediency, he might have been a second Lincoln, a second emancipator! Referring in after years to his great speech on Equal Rights To All he said to the women, "Substitute sex for color, and you have the best speech I could make on your platform." [1]

What shall be said of men, politicians, and statesmen, who to save their party would be willing, because they had the power, to betray one-half the population of their country, the half that needed protection more than any other class? What shall be said of men who, in pleading for justice to the black man, would assert in ringing tones that "freedom without the ballot is mockery" yet were guilty of fighting the proposition to extend the right of suffrage to "all citizens" because "it would enfranchise all the Southern wenches"? If freedom without the ballot was a mockery for the black man, what good was freedom

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, p. 322.

without the ballot to the black woman? Of what use was a ballotless freedom to the woman born a blonde? What shall be said of men who would reason thus?

What shall be said of the men who, for mere party expediency, were willing to insult their mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, by giving to all males whether wise, ignorant, illiterate, degraded, or debased, whether native or foreign born, by giving all males the power to legislate for all females, simply because men were males, and women were females? What shall be said of those men who, knowing only too well the wrongs under which women suffered and still suffer, yet would degrade and dishonor them by lifting over them all the males of an oppressed but yet a backward race? For what purpose, forsooth? Simply that a political party might have a better chance to triumph at the polls. Well might American manhood blush at this wholesale treachery, at this deliberate outraging of the fundamental principles of justice and honor. As for the Republican party, what shall be said of it, save that it missed its greatest opportunity?

"This is the Negro's hour!" was the party shibboleth, but it was not true, for they referred to the male negro only. Alas! What an opportunity to have missed! They could have made it Humanity's Hour and have become immortal, and they weakly succumbed before the age-long fetish of *maleness!*

They played with words that must have rattled with a hollow sound in their very throats as they spoke grandly of "universal suffrage"; "equal rights to all"; "taxation without representation is tyranny"; "Governments derive their just powers only from consent of the governed."

"The ballot is *schoolmaster.* Reading and writing are of inestimable value, but the ballot teaches what these cannot teach. . . . The ballot is like charity which never faileth, and without which man is only as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal. The ballot is the one thing needful, without which rights of testimony and all other rights will be no better than cobwebs, which the master will break through with impunity. To him that hath the ballot all other things shall be given — protection, opportunity,

education, a homestead. . . . As the hand is the work of civilization, so is the ballot the work of government. Give me the ballot and I can move the world. Do you wish to see harmony prevail, so that industry, society, government, civilization may all prosper? Then do not neglect the ballot." [1]

Why did not the words choke them in the very utterance, when well they knew that all this eloquence was but the prelude, the overture, for the establishment of a male autocracy? They violated every principle of honor, every principle of logic, every principle of chivalry and justice, every principle of democracy, they perjured their souls — for what? That a party might live, that *maleness* might triumph, that the superstitions of centuries might continue, that the long-boasted superiority of the male sex might become at last an impregnable legal fact in that far-famed charter of human rights, the Constitution of the United States of America, itself now a living lie!

If their words are true, those who uttered them are self-convicted of the greatest crime

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, p. 168.

the world has ever seen. For, mark you well! these were not the hysterical outbursts of a disfranchised class, nor the rantings of disgruntled self-seekers; these were not the words of foolish women pleading for equality, but the sober, dignified, and impassioned testimony of men in the full possession of their sacred rights, and who would impugn such testimony?

Nor is that the full tale of their treachery. They even stooped so low as to seek to turn to their own ends the class they sought to dishonor and despoil, and they succeeded in the main. By cajolery, by flattery, by false reasoning, by sentimental appeals, by the ways that men know only too well, they enlisted many of the women to their own undoing. Men salved their consciences to their own grave dishonor, and in the willing submissiveness of the submissive sex, saw, no doubt, some justification for their gross treachery. It is the life-long, ay, age-long habit of woman to be self-sacrificing; it is the age-long habit of man to think that self-sacrifice is her first and greatest duty!

To those women who stood firmly for their

rights, who could not be moved by flattery, nor misled by specious reasoning, they said in anger,—"One measure at a time. Suffrage for male negroes first and woman suffrage after." Yet two score years and more have passed away and the pledge is unredeemed!

What then shall be said of men to whom party is more than principle, a political victory more than the virtue of their nation? No Esaus were they, but worse than Esau — poor weak fool that he was — for these men signed away, not their own birthright, but the birthright of their womankind! And shall we call these men great? These petty politicians, these party servers, these betrayers of women, shall we call them statesmen? I think not.

The Fourteenth Amendment ratified, they carried another one through. The Republican party triumphed at the polls, having taken advantage of the popular weakness and capacity for hero-worship. At their leisure they passed the Fifteenth Amendment, again insulting the women of the land, strengthen-

ing the male autocracy; for the new Amendment read:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The monument to *maleness* was now complete. The Fourteenth Amendment was a sin, a crime of commission by the insertion of the word *male* in the so-called human rights charter; the Fifteenth Amendment was a crime of omission by the leaving out of a little word of only three letters, the word *sex*. Such is the monument to injustice and male autocracy which they have grafted upon a supposedly free Government, making it every day a living lie, a monumental deceit, perpetrating a political fraud before the entire world. Such is the monument that the Republican party raised unto itself in its youthful days. It sowed the wind of treachery and deceit, and now in its senility, it wonders why the paralysis of old age should so soon have overtaken it, why the whirlwind should have come.

As for the Democratic party, by its own admission it would have done no better. By what right, it may well be asked, by what right did these two parties take unto themselves the misnomers they still wear; why did they usurp the names Republican and Democratic? Government by the people, of the people, and for the people! Who are the people?

In America, "the land of freedom," politically and legally, the only people are the males; the females are but the medium by which males (or male people) are reproduced. Thus does history repeat itself.

CHAPTER X

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT INVADES THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: YEARS 1869–70

COULD it have been possible for the good fathers of our country — Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, Franklin and the others, to have gazed into a sort of magic stereoscope and conjured up the scene that was enacted in one of the large committee rooms of the national capital, some eighty years or more after they had built their non-committal Constitution, could they have looked into some such glass, they would doubtless have rubbed their eyes with astonishment, readjusted the magic lenses many times, then polished them with their aristocratic or democratic kerchiefs, and looked once more and then again to see if their eyes had not really deceived them, for

the sight was a strange one. It was a United States Congressional Committee receiving and listening to a committee of women asking for full political rights!

It was at the close of the Second National Woman Suffrage Convention held in Washington, D. C. and a committee of women from that body was presenting their claims before a joint committee from Congress. Practically they asked that an experiment in woman suffrage be made with the women of the District of Columbia, and that experiment being made good, to frame a Sixteenth Amendment that should prohibit any State from disfranchising any of its citizens on account of sex.

What took place there is best described by an eye witness [1] who seems to have caught the true spirit and significance of the event.

"The scene was impressive. It was simple, grand, historic. Women have often appeared in history — noble, brilliant, heroic women; but *woman* collectively, impersonally, never until now. To-day, for the first time, she asks recog-

[1] Fannie Howland, in *The Hartford Courant*. See History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, p. 417.

nition in the commonwealth, not in virtue of hereditary noblesse, nor for any excellence or achievement of individuals, but on the simple ground of her presence in the race, with the same rights, interests, responsibilities as man. There was nothing in this gathering at the Capital to touch the imagination with illusion, no ball-room splendor of light and fragrance and jewels, none of those graceful enchantments by which women have been content to reign through brief dynasties of beauty over briefer fealties of homage. The cool light of a winter morning, the bare walls of a committee room, the plain costumes of every day use, held the mind strictly to the simple facts which gave that group of representative men and women its moral significance, its severe but picturesque unity. Some future artist, looking back for a memorable illustration of this period, will put this new Declaration of Independence upon canvas, and will ransack the land for portraits of those ladies who spoke first for their countrywomen at the Capital, and those Senators and Representatives who first gave them audience.

"The gentlemen took their seats around a long table in the middle of the room. Mrs. Stanton stood at one end, serene and dignified.

Behind her sat a large semi-circle of ladies, and close about her a group of her companions, who would have been remarkable anywhere for the intellectual refinement and elevated expression of their earnest faces. Opposite, at the other end of the long table, sat Charles Sumner, looking fatigued and worn, but listening with alert attention. So these two veterans in the cause of freedom were fitly and suggestively brought face to face."

The speakers were Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Paulina Wright Davis, and Madam Anneke. Hannibal Hamlin was the chairman of the meeting and did the honors of the occasion.

The women presented their case with a brevity and a clearness that will command the attention of future generations, if it did not impress the gentlemen who heard it, though Senator Hamlin admitted that he was "almost, if not quite, persuaded." The speeches dealt briefly with the constitutional, historical, and moral aspects, as well as with the essential justice of their claims.

Matilda Joslyn Gage

How came it, one might well ask, that a movement which began with ridicule and opprobrium, whose prime leaders were caricatured, reviled, made light of, how came it that it and they had arrived at the dignity of a national hearing? To the women who took part, it must have seemed natural enough, for they had surely passed through a long enough period of preparation. As for their being impressed by a Congressional hearing, they had time and again appeared before State Legislatures and before conventions and audiences in many States. It was in 1853 that they first went before the Legislature of New York asking for a Prohibitory Law. At great expense they had gathered up twenty-eight thousand names to a petition. In discussing it a young member, after a long speech, asked, "Who are these asking for this law? Nobody but women and children," declaring that women were "out of their sphere" in such work. It was at this time that Miss Anthony made a solemn resolve that it should be her life-work "to make a woman's name on a petition worth as much as a man's."

From that time on, indeed from the inception of the Woman's Rights movement in 1848, or rather from the beginning of the Temperance and Anti-slavery movements, women had been in preparation for whatever the moment might bring. They were no longer amateurs, but seasoned campaigners. They knew their arguments, they knew their wrongs, they knew the remedy, and moreover, they knew how to state their case so as to make the best and most telling effect. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was a polished speaker, and Susan B. Anthony a powerful and convincing one. The first had been in public life for some thirty years, the other had been practising the business of a reformer for fully as long a time.

Just one year previous to that historic hearing by the Congressional Committee — to be exact, in the year 1869 — they had held their first Washington Convention, resolved at last to meet the national law-makers on their own ground. There was wisdom in the procedure, for in July of 1868 the infamous Fourteenth Amendment had been rat-

ified, making *sex* for the first time a basis for regulating the right of suffrage; at least so that dubious act was read by many. Previously they had stormed their various Legislatures to grant them the rights they sought, but now they saw that Congress had the power to create voters, even over the States themselves, wherein the power formally resided, and in this fact they saw great hope. Obviously, it is easier to concentrate upon one body of law-makers than to be obliged to scatter forces upon the various State assemblies.

In many respects the year 1869 was a momentous one. The year was begun auspiciously at the capital, their first convention there a notable one in many ways, being also the first of many such to be annually held there from that time on. It marked also the beginning of a year of conventions which were held in many States, and which did much toward building up permanent local organizations and State societies, arousing a wider and more lasting enthusiasm.

At the annual meeting of their Equal Rights Association in May, the woman dele-

gates from nineteen States decided to form a new organization to be called the National Woman Suffrage Association, whose chief object should be to secure the ballot for women on equal terms with men. Many had felt that their Equal Rights platform was too broad, too comprehensive for practical purposes, and that it served little more than to draw to them all sorts of visionaries and mild lunatics. It was not until the following year, however, that the Equal Rights Society was formally abandoned.

Later in the year another national organization was formed, the American Woman Suffrage Association,[1] with Henry Ward Beecher as its first president. Many notable names appear among its supporters — Lucy Stone, Henry Blackwell, George W. Curtis, George W. Julian, Mary A. Livermore, Myra Bradwell, Julia Ward Howe, William L. Garrison, Louisa M. Alcott, Frances D. Gage, and others too numerous to mention.

The object of the new organization was

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, pp. 406 to 756.

to concentrate activities upon the various legislatures as heretofore, instead of petitioning Congress as the other organization had planned to do. Overtures were made by the first society to have the two merge into one, as their object was practically the same,—to get the right of suffrage. It was felt that there would be a useless division of forces with a consequent waste of energy. The offer was rejected and the societies remained distinct for some twenty years.

Far more important than the founding of societies was the thrilling news that the Territory of Wyoming had conferred full citizenship upon its women, making them equal in every way to men. From Great Britain also came word that the English Parliament had conferred the right of municipal franchise upon English taxpaying women. This great step was due to the labor and brilliant arguments of John Stuart Mill and Jacob Bright. It is said that in one night the suggestion passed from one of jest to one of justice, and direct taxation without direct representation became impossible, in England at least. Mill's splendid book, "The

Subjection of Women," and his wife's able essay, "The Enfranchisement of Women" had much to do with preparing the way for this great reform.

Meanwhile other forces were at work. A newspaper, named in accordance with its projected aim and character *The Revolution*, had been established through the generosity of Mr. George Francis Train and Mr. David M. Meliss, financial editor of *The New York World*, to carry on the propaganda. Long had the leaders felt the need of a mouthpiece for their wrongs, a medium whereby they might demand their rights, and an agent for advancing their cause. With pulpit, press, and politicians in bitter hostility against them, they had felt the almost utter impossibility of carrying on a reform movement without a publication. Now this was changed.

A little later *The Agitator* was started in Chicago by Mary A. Livermore, but was soon afterwards bought and merged with *The Woman's Journal* in Boston. The *Journal* was incorporated in 1870, was

owned by a joint-stock company, and for years was ably edited by Lucy Stone and Henry Blackwell. It has stood the storms of time, and is to-day the chief suffrage paper in America, with Alice Stone Blackwell, daughter of Lucy Stone and Henry Blackwell, as editor-in-chief. As for *The Revolution*, the year 1870 saw the end of the fiery sheet, for it was too radical for the times.

By means of State conventions, local conventions, the annual Washington convention in January, the anniversary in May, founding societies in the interest of equal rights, innumerable petitions and resolutions, the Woman's cause moved slowly on. In the very nature of things this great movement is essentially an educational one, and all these many conventions, meetings, organizations, these hundreds of speeches, these thousands of petitions, were simply the occasions for active propaganda, so much missionary labor for a great and holy cause.

CHAPTER XI

VICTORIA WOODHULL INVADES THE WOMAN MOVEMENT

THERE was consternation among the leaders of the suffrage forces on the evening of January 10, 1871, when they met in Washington preparatory to their third annual convention there. In itself their convention promised to be a brilliant affair. It had been engineered and planned by an enthusiastic new convert, Isabella Beecher Hooker, who, with Josephine S. Griffing and Paulina Wright Davis, had promised to give it all the prestige her connection with it could confer. Later she found that more was needed to conduct a great convention successfully than social and family prestige, but, in spite of all, it was finally a success and is still known by her name as the Hooker Convention.

Fearful that all might not go well if left entirely to inexperienced hands, Miss Anthony cancelled a goodly number of lecture engagements and hurried to Washington in time to help with final plans; and all went well until it was learned that the Judiciary Committee of Congress was to grant a hearing to Victoria C. Woodhull on the morrow at the very hour that their convention was to open, on a question involving full citizenship for women.

No wonder there was consternation! They had called women together from all parts of the country to consider the taking of steps toward praying Congress to grant a Sixteenth Amendment conferring the franchise upon all their sex, and here was a woman, alone and unaided, who had already caught the attention of that body by declaring boldly that by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments women were already enfranchised, and she merely asked the National Assembly to pass a Declaratory Act to that effect.

Apparently at a single bound she had achieved more than all that they had accom-

plished in twenty years. It was unthinkable! After a hasty consultation, however, they at last decided to adjourn their opening session for a few hours, while the generals in charge went on a skirmishing expedition to see what all this might mean to them and their beloved cause.

In a way they were prepared for part of their surprise, for who in that day had not heard of Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennessee Claflin, her sister, the sensations of New York? For full a twelvemonth now, the press had heralded them and their achievements abroad. Just one year before, they had astounded the world by opening up a luxurious banking and brokerage establishment in New York City upon a solid financial foundation. This proved more than a nine days' wonder, and it practically introduced them to the world at large.

Barely had this become established when Mrs. Woodhull published a *pronunciamento*, in which she announced herself as a candidate for the next Presidency in 1872! Rumor said that both women were comparatively young, that both were handsome, that

Mrs. John Biddulph Martin

(Formerly Victoria Claflin Woodhull)

they had large resources, conducted their business well; and speculation was once more rife concerning these two enigmas among women.

Hardly had this sensation died down when it was announced that Woodhull and Claflin, the female firm of bankers and brokers, had launched out into the editorial and publishing field; and with that a handsome weekly newspaper, called *The Woodhull and Claflin Weekly*, made its appearance, apparently for the express purpose of sustaining Mrs. Woodhull's presidential candidacy. Of course it advocated woman suffrage, though later it was more devoted to the true equality of woman and man. It launched into politics, finances, outdoor sports, fashions, and the usual literature. From the first it was practically a success and its circulation reached fifty thousand each week.

Sensation followed sensation, each one heralded far and wide by the press of the country. Then came the "Startling Annunciation," from the pen of Victoria Woodhull, claiming that under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments women were already

enfranchised by positive law and that the Sixteenth Amendment, proposed by other suffragists, was a dead letter. Not content with this, Victoria Woodhull had within the month pressed her opinions upon Congress itself. She had presented a Memorial asking for a Declaratory Law which should secure more definitely the law already embodied in the aforementioned Amendments. The Memorial was stale news by this time.

The Woodhull and Claflin sisters! Indeed, who that was not blind and deaf had not heard of them? Had they not created sensations enough without being scheduled for a Congressional Committee hearing on their opening day, to say nothing of discussing the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments before the Judiciary Committee when they had called a Convention for the express purpose of discussing a Sixteenth Amendment? What manner of woman was this Victoria C. Woodhull anyway, who apparently bent men to her will, who overcame insuperable obstacles, who did sensational things in a highly sensational way, and who was altogether out of the ordinary? Al-

ready rumors were afloat as to her peculiar social theories and the source of her immense financial successes. What did it all mean?

Again the historic scene was enacted that would have startled the good fathers of the Revolution. This time it would have startled them the more, for the lady who opened the meeting was a self-nominated candidate for the next presidential election! After the reading of her Memorial she addressed the Committee, further elaborating her arguments.

It was her first public speech, but her dignified bearing, her beauty, her refinement, her modesty, her slightly trembling voice, her logic, and unanswerable arguments won her hearers entirely, for the moment at least. There were other speakers after her, but as she had covered all the points, they were superfluous.

When the momentous interview was over, Victoria Woodhull was invited to read her Memorial and her speech at the suffrage convention, with the result that she changed their entire line of argument in favor of her

own. She had convinced them that her reasoning was correct. Probably, however, the women were impressed because she had impressed Congress with the soundness of her views, for many had held before that the Fourteenth Amendment did enfranchise women; others that the Constitution itself conferred citizenship upon them, and many able speeches had been made upon these points. However, Victoria C. Woodhull had again achieved prominence, and once more the press blazoned forth her enterprise.

Truly she was a great and instant success no matter where she went. Like a meteor she came into their sky and all the fixed stars there paled before her brilliancy. Although it was a great convention and did much toward carrying the suffrage movement on to higher achievements than ever before, yet as Ida Husted-Harper in her "Life of Susan B. Anthony" says, the advent of Mrs. Woodhull upon their platform "precipitated a storm of criticism, compared with which all those that had gone before were as a summer shower to a Missouri cyclone." Already the

slander of malicious tongues had begun to spread their poison, and there was an outcry against this woman, who was charged with being a "free-lover" or some such thing. Men poured in their objections in vain, for the women were beginning to feel that only too long had they sacrificed their own sex, men creating the public opinion and women playing the executioner.

As for Mrs. Woodhull, the women were charmed with her, as were the men who met her. A correspondent wrote of her at that memorable meeting: "Mrs. Woodhull sat sphinx-like during the Convention. General Grant himself might learn a lesson of silence from the pale, sad face of this unflinching woman. . . . She reminds one of the forces in nature behind the storm, or of a small splinter of the indestructible, and if her veins were opened they would be found to contain ice."

The immediate result of Victoria Woodhull's bold and daring plan was that the Judiciary Committee gave her a long and dignified, though scarcely logical, answer,

for they but repeated history in what they did. The Committee was divided in its sentiments, however, and the minority, composed of General Benjamin F. Butler of Massachusetts and Judge William Loughridge of Iowa, brought in a minority report as well, in which an exhaustive study of the argument was made and an eloquent plea put forth for absolute equality of citizenship for all.[1]

Victoria Woodhull had laid her plans well, had forced her opinions upon the entire country, and actually forced Congress to go on record concerning them. Her campaign was laid out like that of a veteran and she spared neither time, energy, nor expense to gain her point. On the morning of the introduction of her Memorial into Congress a printed copy of it together with a statement of her principal arguments was found on every desk. Because of the brilliancy of her attack, the novelty and originality of the documents, they were copied *verbatim* into the press of the entire country and the prop-

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, pp. 461–482.

osition that women, under the existing law, the Constitution, are entitled to the ballot, became at once a national question, while her name became even more famous. She was seen to be equally at home in finance, literature, and legal lore, and few there are that can successfully be financier, editor, and constitutional lawyer, at one and the same time.

So unexpected had been her attack upon Congress, that before that body aroused itself from its dazed condition, her Memorial was referred to its proper Committee and at least it received a dignified hearing. When the exhaustive reports of the Committee came out, she had thousands of them printed, together with her Memorial and her argument in support of it, and sent them broadcast over the land. Her own magazine was almost entirely devoted to this subject for the time and thus it came before every editor in the United States. It is said she spent some ten thousand dollars in this propaganda.

As for the Convention, not only did she change the line of reasoning, but her argument resulted in the appointment of an

educational committee, who prepared a Declaration of Rights for the women, under the new reading of the Amendments, and also a Pledge that the signers would exercise their full rights so soon as the legal power was given them. This Declaration and Pledge were signed by eighty thousand women and later sent to Congress.[1]

So far as the press was concerned, for perhaps some eighteen months Victoria C. Woodhull dominated the suffrage movement, and conventions that she graced were blazoned forth as "Woodhull Conventions" in bold, black type. Before she entered into the movement she had proclaimed herself a candidate for the Presidency in 1872, and consistently she pushed her campaign in her own sheet.

Then she conceived the idea of forming a People's party that should unite all the reform forces of the country and for it she prepared a platform that no party has yet surpassed. She advocated radical reforms in the civil service, in labor laws, in the prin-

[1] Life of Susan Brownell Anthony. Husted-Harper. Vol. I, p. 378.

ciples of protection, revenue, and taxation, in the system of criminal jurisprudence and education, many of which ideas are only now beginning to be put into practice.

She advocated a Grand International Tribunal which is now realized in our Peace Conferences at The Hague. She suggested direct representation for both majorities and minorities; advanced the idea of a single six-year term for the President, with a retiring life pension and a permanent seat in the Federal Senate, that the nation might have the advantage of his experience and ripening thought, divorced from politics. Barely five pages long, her party platform might well repay the study of our aspiring politicians, both for brevity and comprehensiveness, to say nothing of lucidity.

Her idea was that the new party, composed mainly of women, no doubt, would hold the balance of power and thus force one or other of the great parties to adopt its measures. But the leaders of the various movements saw in her a rival, and divisions and dissensions arose. Although, in convention assembled, some five hundred delegates or-

ganized the party, adopted her platform, and enthusiastically nominated her as Presidential candidate, the brilliant proposal was never carried through.

Susan B. Anthony, with all the ruggedness of her determined nature, refused to combine with the new leader or the new party; she refused them the use of her hall, rented for the usual convention and, almost deserted by her old adherents, she went through with the remaining sessions, lonely and heartsore, but feeling that she had saved the ship. Even though Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Hooker and others reproached her, called her narrow and bigoted, she felt that she had rescued the National Suffrage Association from disaster and from Victoria Woodhull.

Yet in the light of the present day it might well be asked if she did not then err in her judgment. For while their minds were busy with arguments and reasoning, with plans for Congressional hearings, the Woodhull mind shot clear ahead of all this as so much rubbish and projected a practical, scientific, and humanitarian scheme for a new

party to carry out practical (though at that time visionary) ideas in a practical manner.

Not only did Miss Anthony blunder, but Victoria Woodhull herself miscalculated. As has been said, "Like all great leaders, she made herself"; and undoubtedly she considered herself born to do a work for women; but her plans were too daring, too radical for them to grasp fully, and she lost out.

Evidently Miss Anthony won, for in 1872 the women worked in the Grant and Wilson campaign, actually canvassed for votes for the Republican party! Strange that they could so soon forget! Strange that a tiny splinter, so infinitesimal as to be scarcely perceptible to the unaided eye, placed in the big clumsy platform of the Republican party, could allure those women who had been so lately tricked and outraged by that same party! Sometimes it seems as if men were justified in despising women; so prone they are to forgive, so slow to avenge indignities!

Meanwhile Victoria C. Woodhull was

learning the ways of a lecturer and speaking to crowded houses on constitutional law regarding women and their rights. Her party, evidently, had gone to pieces; the women were terror-stricken. It was so much more respectable to work for the Republican party than to have one of their own! Besides, the men in gratitude would surely do something to reward them for their labor if they would but help them to win this time! Will women never learn the lesson of self-respect?

Apparently Victoria Woodhull, alone and unaided, was in the zenith of her career, but soon dark days fell upon her. In an evil hour she was arrested, and, with her sister, thrown into prison. Time and again they were arrested and, with this new sensation, Victoria Woodhull became not a lecturer, but an orator. She began as a political lecturer; she ended as a social reformer, a woman orator. No longer did fortune smile upon her; adversity was now her companion. Publicity changed to notoriety, and notoriety to scandal; for Victoria C. Woodhull and Tennessee Claflin were charged by the Federal

Government with the crime of obscenity. They would go to prison, stay until bailed out or the trial was over, and then Victoria would hurry away to lecture upon vital themes, and hurry back to be present at her trial. Again she would adopt disguise in order to be present at her own lecture.

With each onslaught she grew more brave. She attacked the church, but not religion; she discussed politics, government, law, and finance like a seasoned statesman; she attacked the social question; in return the pulpit denounced her, the press reviled her, and the Government persecuted her.

She was at bay, and yet she defied the world. If she had thought at first that she was really called to lead the suffrage movement to victory as a second Joan of Arc, she now believed that she was called to deliver the race itself from a bondage worse than death. Nor did she flinch. Her business as banker and broker was wrecked by the scandals that attached to both her name and her sister's. Her magazine was interdicted and her employees thrown in jail with her. Scandals multiplied and plots gathered around

her, but still she went on. Hotels were closed to her, schools were denied her children, but still the people flocked to see her and to hear her, while she was forced to pay heavy toll to every hotel-keeper, every agent for theatre, church, or hall, for the privilege of resting or speaking there.

Her crime? She attacked the social question in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*. She, or rather they, insisted that the male prostitute should be punished equally with the female prostitute. They demanded absolute equality on the "grounds of individuality and sovereignty"; that this standard "shall rule in Church, State, and society in all their phases"; and ended by saying, "This we will have, if we should in the effort uproot all foundations and precipitate revolution and chaos."

They took up the cause of the female prostitute, and dared the male prostitute to battle. They asked for strict "justice — not mercy, not charity." "If it is wrong to mother an illegal child, it is equally wrong to father it"; "if female prostitution is wrong,

then male prostitution is equally wrong"; "if women are inspected, then men should be inspected"; "if the names of women are recorded, then the names of men should be recorded."

They threatened exposure of men high in society, if it were necessary, in their battle for equality. Who shall say that these women were not brave? Read what they dared to publish and then wonder at their courage!

"Jeptha was not more faithful to his vow in offering to the gods the idol of his heart, the virgin daughter of his home, than we shall be in laying on this altar of justice the most exalted and prominent men of society. We are now prepared to state facts on which we demand a change in the existing status of woman, and claim for her equal protection, by law, with the corresponding male offender, who now deems her his lawful prey and makes her person, property, and rights pay loot to his passion; . . . she has no redress. She is an outcast, and according to the logic of masters, she is also an outlaw without any rights which any one is bound to respect."

They rehearsed the wrongs of the prostitute, showing how the law discriminated against them, while the officers of the law enforced tribute from them. They exposed the shams of society, and its evils. "Women must *come up*, or men must *come down*. Our mission is but commenced; the battle is opened. We ask no quarter and take no prisoners. Having set our hands to the plough, we will not look back nor turn aside until our work is done. The world shall know the wrongs women suffer, and the men who inflict them."

Small wonder that terror-stricken men turned loose the flood-gates of their hate and fear upon them, and that man's government came to the rescue of its creatures. Disfranchised women, they had no power; and yet, though they were arrested and imprisoned eight times, though they were hounded, persecuted, the Government at last was forced to dismiss suit against them, for lack of evidence. Though they escaped the legal punishment, they paid the penalty in full, in loss of wealth, social position, friends, and in calumny.

As for Victoria herself, she taught intelligent parentage, that the human body is the Temple of God, that the sexual organs should be holy organs; the procreative act the holiest act of life; that woman is the architect of Humanity, and should be mistress of her own body. She taught a philosophy so pure, so high, so ideal, that few have yet grasped it, and all this in language with which no fault can even yet be found.

She believed she had a mission to perform, that she was born to suffer thus.

"I am charged with seeking notoriety; but who among you would accept my notoriety and pay a tithe of its costs to me? Driven from my former beautiful home, reduced from affluence to want, my business broken up and destroyed, dragged from one jail to another, and in a short time I am to be arraigned before the courts and stand trial for telling the truth. I have been smeared with the most opprobrious epithets and the vilest names, and stigmatized as a bawd and blackmailer. Now, until you are ready to accept my notoriety, with its conditions — to suffer what I have suffered and am yet to suffer — do not dare to impugn my mo-

tives. As to your approval or dissent, your applause or your curses, they have not a feather's weight with me; I am set apart for a high and sacred duty, and I shall perform it without fear or favor." [1]

At last, broken in health but not in spirit, she fled from the country of her birth to find a haven in a foreign land. Saddened by an irreparable sorrow she had pleaded for the true equality of man and woman, and for justice to the child. She probed the diseases of society as a surgeon would — with a knife that cuts. She showed the path to liberty for the race, and which way lay racial death. That was her crime.

She invaded the Woman Movement, and even though they repudiated her, she dragged the leaders after her. She opened up the way for others to lecture fearlessly on the "Social Problem" without loss of caste or favor. Elizabeth Cady Stanton said of her: —

[1] *Leavenworth* (Kan.) *Times*, January 11, 1874. (Quoted in "Temple of God," Victoria C. Woodhull, p. 393.)

"Victoria Woodhull has done a work for woman that none of us could have done. She has faced and dared men to call her the names that make women shudder. She has risked and realized the sort of ignominy that would have paralyzed any of us who have longer been called strong-minded. Leaping into the brambles that were too high for us to see over them, she broke a path into their close and thorny interstices, with a steadfast faith that glorious principle would triumph at last over conspicuous ignominy, although her life might be sacrificed; and when, with a meteor's flash, she sank into the dismal swamp, we could not lift her out of the mire nor buoy her through the deadly waters. She will be as famous as she has been infamous, made so by benighted or cowardly men and women. In the annals of emancipation the name of Victoria Woodhull will have its own high place as deliverer." [1]

[1] *New York Times*, July, 1875. Quoted in "Temple of God," Victoria C. Woodhull, p. 440.

CHAPTER XII

THE MOVEMENT GETS INTO THE CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COURTS

IT was a blushing, stammering gentleman who was ushered into the presence of Miss Anthony one afternoon late in the year 1872. Considering his errand he deserves much commendation for his blushes and confusion, for, as United States deputy marshal, he had called to tell her that she was under arrest on a Federal charge, and to request her to accompany him to court. It was a criminal charge, being a crime against the United States Government. For a moment she was astounded.

She had lived through much, had passed the half-century milestone of her life, had endured persecution, denunciation, ridicule, opprobrium, opposition; had faced mobs and audiences cold and lukewarm, and after many

years of misunderstanding was now fast becoming recognized as an honored leader of women, a national celebrity. Imagine Susan B. Anthony, reformer, abolitionist, woman's righter, as a criminal and prisoner in the Federal jail! It was unthinkable!

The deputy blushed. Miss Anthony, her first surprise over, calmly made arrangements to go with him, suggesting meanwhile that handcuffs would be a suitable accompaniment to the ceremony. The deputy declined.

It happened that Miss Anthony was not alone in her legal ignominy. With her in the commission of the crime were fourteen other women, grave, dignified gentlewomen, many of them in middle life, with thoughtful, kindly faces. They too, evidently, had received calls from blushing, stammering gentlemen.

Their first examination took place in a dingy little room where in former years runaway slaves were examined and returned to their lawful owners.[1] This was most significant, in view of what was happening, for the women had contended for years that their

[1] Life of Susan Brownell Anthony. Husted-Harper. Vol. I, p. 427

status was practically that of the black race of the South, and that they were all slaves together. Minutely their testimony was examined; they admitted the fact that they were women, and in due time they were indicted by the grand jury and held to trial, though they were permitted to furnish bail.

Their crime, you ask? It was grave indeed. Little wonder that the Government of the greatest republic on earth was compelled to take a hand the better to restrain ill-advised persons, such as they were, from rash and illegal acts. It is one of the functions for which governments are designed. These fifteen women had indeed offended the beneficent Government under which they lived, which Government declared loudly and grandly to the whole world that it was a "self-evident truth that all men are created free and equal," and that "taxation without representation is tyranny," and that "governments derive their just powers only from consent of the governed." Moreover, it magnanimously offered "an asylum to the oppressed of every foreign land." It proclaimed freedom to all, and these

fifteen persons had actually taken the Government at its word and committed the unpardonable sin. They voted, being women! Such was their crime!

It was not without due deliberation and competent legal advice that they had taken this step. From the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land, they reasoned thus: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . are citizens; no State shall deny or abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens;" and "the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied."

The call to their annual convention in 1872 was brief and showed their convictions on the subject, for they were summoned together to consider the "new departure," and in their resolutions they demanded a declaratory act such as Victoria Woodhull had suggested. Their main argument they built upon the Butler and Loughridge Minority Report to the Woodhull Memorial. Charles Sumner asserted that the Constitution itself guaranteed all the necessary rights; but they

the press pouring out its tons of printed matter dealing with it from various standpoints, how could one be ignorant of the fact that the great Constitution was indeed the National Sphinx, saying neither "Yea" nor "Nay," but sitting imperturbable and immovable in the sands of time?

To return to Miss Anthony. Determined that her possible jurors should know at least the constitutional points involved, with the help of Matilda Joslyn Gage she canvassed the county where the crime had been committed. Her speech was a masterpiece of legal arguments, logic, history, and common sense, while Mrs. Gage's was a scathing denunciation of the National Government.

Lest the possible jurors might, indeed, become too well informed on nice little discriminations, the scene of the trial was hastily shifted to a neighboring county. Undaunted by this trick, the women canvassed that county also, but their labor was lost, for when the time came, the judge dismissed the jury, and read his decision written before he had heard the evidence! In such fashion

are those treated who are denied by force their fundamental rights.

It was indeed a trial of tremendous importance; the status of millions of people hung in the balance and might be changed by the decision of the judge sitting upon the bench. Only too well he knew the fact, and, big with his temporary importance, he made the most of the power with which he was invested

The trial [1] was a farce, a foregone conclusion from the very beginning. It was conceded that the prisoner at the bar was a woman; sifted down, that was her crime. She was ably defended by her friend, Judge Seldon, but it was not a court where right and justice ruled. The decision was made before the evidence was heard, for the presiding judge had taken the forethought to write his opinion before he was unduly influenced by the evidence in the case.

By another unwarranted usurpation of power he also dismissed the jury and him-

[1] For complete details see History of Woman Suffrage. Stanton, Anthony, Gage. Vol. II, Chap. XXV.

self brought in a verdict of *guilty*, with a punishment in the shape of a fine, which he wisely never tried to collect, and which the prisoner vowed she would never pay. So ended the trial of Susan B. Anthony for the crime of casting a ballot in a ballot-box in the one country in the world publicly dedicated to human freedom and human rights.

As for the inspectors who were guilty of accepting the votes of the women who cast the illegal ballots, they were sentenced also to pay fines, and on refusing to pay were remanded to prison for their offence; but it was not long before they were actually pardoned by the President of the United States, General Grant, and no questions asked. It is most significant that not only was Miss Anthony denied the right of trial by jury, but she was not allowed to testify in her own defence, both of which absolutely fundamental rights were freely granted to the election inspectors, when their trial was on.

This was not the only trial that came before the people. True to their pledge and

awake to the situation, feeling that the withholding of the ballot was a stigma upon their sex, and knowing full well that until this one right was conceded all other rights were far from safe, there were women in various parts of the country not only willing, but eager, to secure their right by the simple act of taking it.

To Marilla M. Ricker, a young widow living in Dover, New Hampshire, belongs the honor of being one of the first to try to vote. She went to register and thought her name had been put upon the list, but when she tried to vote she found that the selectman had purposely omitted it. This was early in 1870. Unfortunately she was persuaded from prosecuting the election officials for refusing the vote of a citizen on the ground of sex, and so lost her chance of being the first woman to bring suit to sustain her rights.

In Detroit, Michigan, Nannette B. Gardner had a vastly different experience. Presenting herself in her own ward, she stated that she was a "person" within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, that she was

a widow, a taxpayer and had no representation. To show that after all it is a matter of personal opinion of those in power, it is well to state that the inspector, Peter Hill by name, seeing the justice of her demand, entered her name upon the voting list and later received her vote.

It was not without some controversy on the part of the authorities that this right was allowed her, but somehow, according to the records, she voted regularly every year so long as she remained in Detroit, and her vote was accepted and counted. In another ward, however, Catherine A. F. Stebbins tried again and again to register and vote, but was denied, although many earnest men believed she had the right and urged the authorities to accept her name.

A month later Sara Andrews Spencer and Sarah E. Webster, acting for themselves and some seventy other women in the District of Columbia, brought suit against the Board of Inspectors for refusing to take their votes. After the usual elaborate trial, Justice Cartter gravely decided that they were voters but had no right to vote!

That there is romance and chivalry even in this dry and barren chapter of legal absurdities is shown by the story of the women of Washington Territory, which, of course, has all the dash and go of frontier life. Though their Constitution allowed the right, "all white American citizens above twenty-one years of age being allowed to vote," Mrs. Mary Olney Brown and her daughter of Olympia, were the only women at first who had the courage of their convictions. They were refused, and there was much gossip over the event.

The next year, 1870, at Grand Mound, about twenty-five miles from Olympia, Mrs. Charlotte Olney French, a sister of Mrs. Brown, was able to interest her whole neighborhood. They were wise with the wisdom of women, and planned a splendid picnic dinner to be given at the polls on election day, the schoolhouse being the polling place. They calmly went, spread out their luncheon, invited all present to dine with them, meanwhile discussing all the points involved and answering all objections. Needless to say they voted, and perhaps it is prophetic of the

good times coming when citizens will all break bread together preparatory to the ceremony of casting their ballots.

It so happened that the women of Black River got wind of their plans. "If the Grand Mound women vote," they said, "the women of Black River shall vote, too." Accordingly, they stationed a man with a fleet horse at the Grand Mound schoolhouse with instructions to ride back at full speed the moment the women began to vote.

"They 're voting! They 're voting!" he shouted at the top of his voice, and swung his hat the moment he got within sight of the Black River schoolhouse. The news having been anticipated, the teams were all ready and waiting, and with that they went flying in all directions to bring the women back to exercise their constitutional right. In the face of this testimony who shall say that equality endangers chivalry? [1]

The most important case outside the Anthony case, however, proved to be in Missouri, where Virginia L. Minor brought suit

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. III, pp. 780–84.

because she was not allowed to register, and carried her case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Her husband, Francis Minor, an attorney, made an exhaustive study of the subject. He prosecuted the case, arguing that by the Fourteenth Amendment all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens and entitled to the franchise. It was not settled until 1875, when Chief Justice Waite, in an elaborate decision came to the conclusion that in so far as women are concerned the States have absolute control; that women had always been citizens, but that citizens were not necessarily voters! Alas and alas! Why all those birth-throes of Congress to bring forth the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to confer citizenship upon the male negro? They should have made them voters instead and not troubled themselves about their citizenship.

In other ways the women were made to feel the limitations that the law imposed upon them as women. There was Myra Bradwell of Illinois, editor of the *Chicago*

Legal News. She was qualified to be a lawyer, having passed her examination and received her certificate, but for the crime of being married was refused a licence to practise law. It must have been a crime, else the learned gentlemen who discussed the case would never have wasted so much eloquence upon it. You see, since the days of asceticism, marriage has been in disrepute, but for that matter ever since the days of Eve, woman herself, whether married or unmarried, has been in still graver disrepute.

Verily, if one would be amused he had best read legal and theological lore as it affects womankind. Between the lover and the poet on the one side, and the theologian and the lawmaker on the other, it has been difficult for woman to prove her humanity; for on the one hand it was claimed that she was of angelic descent; on the other that she was perhaps the offspring of the Prince of Evil himself. Thus the battle raged for centuries and still confuses our philosophy.

Myra Bradwell carried her case to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the decision of the lower courts was sus-

tained, the Supreme Court declaring that it had "no jurisdiction," and that the right must be granted by the State Legislature. Thus it was that women learned by dear and costly experience that as citizens of the United States they had neither civil rights nor national protection.

From time to time women had protested against taxation without representation, some going so far as to refuse absolutely to pay. The most notable case was that of Julia and Abby Smith of Glastonbury, Connecticut, who, rather than pay their taxes without the privilege of voting, allowed their fine dairy cows and rich meadow-lands to be sold, year after year, at public auction, until even the assessor grew ashamed to visit them.

These women attracted wide attention because of their plucky stand. At the time they made their fight they were aged women, with neither brothers, husbands, nor sons. They were highly educated ladies as well as thrifty farmers, earning by their labors a goodly income. Becoming converted to the principles of equal rights, they carried their

conviction to the logical end and resisted taxation. When at last they were reduced to two cows they named them respectively "Votey" and "Taxey," and it is recorded that "Taxey" was always aggressive, while "Votey" was ever timid and shy.

Lucy Stone had long since gone on record on the subject, and held that women were in duty bound to resist taxation even though they should lose all they had, and that by combining they could force the Government to consider their rights. Dr. Harriot K. Hunt protested every year, and many others did the same.

In 1868 a number of anti-tax societies were organized, chief among which was that of Rochester, N. Y. The war taxes made big inroads upon incomes and laid heavy burdens on all property. Large meetings of protest were called in many places, as the women felt the pressure severely, and at last they resolved to resist. It was in vain they struggled, however, and, after many fruitless appeals for justice, they gave up the attempt. Strange, is it not, that men laud to the sky the historic Boston Tea Party, by

which the participators lost not a cent, and yet will continue year after year to collect the taxes of unrepresented persons, and prosecute to the fullest extent of the law any one brave enough to resist their tyranny?

Men boast of their chivalry, of the fulness of their protection, yet they inflict upon helpless women wrongs which they themselves would never suffer. If the women resist, the courts are set in motion; back of the court stand the prison, the Government, and the army. Truly, men have but little of which to boast in their treatment of women as a class, whether the women be brave or meekly submissive.

In their struggles with law and legal restrictions the women learned some curious things. For instance, it was Elizabeth Cady Stanton,[1] who in 1866 amazed many astute lawyers and other wise men by announcing herself, in all seriousness, as a self-nominated candidate for Congress from her district. To the surprise of those who investigated the

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. II, pp. 180–81.

matter it was found that though a woman be not permitted to vote, there is absolutely nothing to prevent her from holding office if she be elected. Since then many other women have announced themselves as candidates at different times and places. Such are the vagaries of the instruments by which men have sought to maintain their own civic rights.

They learned that Congress had the necessary power to give the male negro the right to vote, but that it was powerless to confer the same right upon the female negro or upon the white woman. They learned that the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land — except where women are concerned; and that States' rights was a dead letter, a belated principle of Government, only in so far as they themselves were concerned.

After the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments were passed, conferring full citizenship upon the male negro, they learned that "the United States has no citizens of its own creation," but that naturally they belonged to the several States! But why

enumerate the many things they learned? for they found out that the judiciary in its decisions was curiously in sympathy and complete harmony with the leading party in power, and that the Government was absolutely false to its fundamental principles. "America!" a foreigner is said to have once exclaimed. "That is the nation that forever boasts of equal liberty to all its citizens, and is the only great nation that traffics in human flesh."

Needless to say the women in the movement were familiar with all these historic attempts to resist taxation. They were familiar with the usual outcome of such attempts. Familiar, too, were they with all the various trials and cases, which they followed in every crook and devious turn. They were not deceived by fatuous reasoning nor misled by futile arguments. They tore those ponderous judicial decisions to tatters and held the tatters up to scorn, as, point by point, they showed them to be fallacies.

For the few speeches and documents in their favor they were indeed grateful. It is amazing how cheaply some men have won

fame among the contenders for equal rights. Just a sentence has at times purchased it.

However, the women's legal training profited them little. Of what use, for instance, was it for Susan B. Anthony to proclaim that if the United States could punish her for voting, it must also have the power to protect her in the exercise of that right? Of what concern was it to the United States, if it had no voters of its own, to care who voted in New York? It was purely a case of meddling in a matter in which it had no concern. However, it was in just such sorts of legal tangles and absurdities that the women found themselves, no matter which way they turned.

At every point they were worsted by their self-elected legal masters. In Congress, legislatures, and courts, it was plainly shown them that they were aliens and outsiders in the land of their birth. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States were found to be not for them, but for males alone. Truly, it is inconceivable how thinking women, in the face of such facts as these, can still be loyal and do

reverence to these utterly unworthy masculine documents. Nor would it be treasonable were women to teach their children to despise these pieces of paper. Under the law as it is interpreted, being absolutely divorced from participation in Government and its concerns, and having no part nor parcel in it, how can women possibly commit treason, no matter what they do? Treason is the attempt to betray the Government to which one owes allegiance, and surely no one will contend after this that women owe any allegiance to the Government of the United States of America?

CHAPTER XIII

"THE WHIRLWIND OF THE LORD" AND WHAT CAME OF IT

AGAIN it would have been a prophet indeed, one worthy of great honor, who could have foretold the far-reaching consequences of the meeting of a little "fair-haired" school-teacher with a band of religious enthusiasts in the city of Pittsburg, Pa., one early Autumn day in the year 1874. She had read much of the wonderful temperance crusade that had swept over the country like a whirlwind. She had felt the effects of the whirlwind, as indeed who had not? but as yet she had not seen the crusade itself. Nearly a year had passed since the first wonderful manifestation had come "like a Christmas gift to the world," and the crusade against the saloon had spread like wildfire fanned by a mighty wind; and here she

was where the last eddying gusts were fast dying out, and she felt that she must see the crusade as it really was.

She was a woman of education and culture and high in the ranks of her own profession, a devout Christian and a believer in prayer. She was visiting in the city for a few days, and when she expressed a wish to join in the crusade, her friends, surprised, turned her over to some one else and washed their hands of her.

Wonderingly she glanced at her companions, and, though she had travelled the world over, the sight was strange to her and difficult to understand. Two by two they had walked down the streets until they came to a saloon in the heart of the city. Being denied admission they ranged themselves in front of it along the curbstone, a line of earnest women, many of them on the downward slope of life.

Behind them over the stony pavement rumbled the heavy wagons; before them passed the city throng, the men, many of them, lifting their hats as they passed, while

above the tumult of the city street, their voices rose high and clear in a Christian hymn. Then one woman, whose life was crowned with sorrow, knelt down upon the cold, moist pavement and offered up a broken-hearted prayer, for her son had gone to ruin through the door before which she knelt.

The leader signalled, and two by two the band of women moved on again, this time to enter in behind a swinging door beyond; and still the traveller wondered. A sickening odor greeted her; the scene was new, disturbing. There were shelves with glittering glasses and decanters; a high, heavily corniced counter of polished wood; barrels pointing outwards, each with its spigot; the floor was covered thick with sawdust, and here and there was a table with chairs around it. Then while the motley crowd of unwashed, unkempt men looked on, the leader, a tall, stately lady opened up her Bible and read aloud, and was followed by the band, singing "Rock of Ages." A whisper came to the stranger. Would she pray?

With that all wonder ceased, and as if

Frances E. Willard

Frances Willard had always done so, she knelt there on the sawdust floor, the little band around her, and curious eyes watching her from every corner. According to her own testimony, never before, save once, had she prayed so earnestly; and when she arose, it was with the settled purpose in her heart to make the cause of temperance her life work, for Frances Willard had then and there been [1] baptized into the ranks of the Crusaders, though she little realized where she was to lead them in the years to come.

In her delightful retreat as Dean of Women and Professor of Esthetics at Northwestern University in the little city of Evanston, Illinois, Frances Willard had been thrilled for months by the newspaper ac-

[1] Miss Willard really entered the Temperance movement in Chicago, some months before. She herself had been addressing meetings in Chicago whenever called upon, but the movement in Chicago was confined to churches. Though the whole country was aroused, yet not in every place did the real Crusade appear, consequently she did not see that phase until months after, in Pittsburg. She entered the movement in a Chicago church; she was "baptized into the Crusade" in a Pittsburg saloon.

counts of the woman's temperance crusade. She knew the story well, and had just lately called upon the man [1] who was the innocent cause of it all. He had nothing to offer beyond the mild injunction that prayer would solve the problem of the drink curse, but notwithstanding the fact that she was an ardent Christian, she knew that prayer alone was not the remedy.

For a long time he had been preaching his doctrine, and at last his words had fallen upon fruitful ground. It was in the little town of Hillsboro, Ohio, in December of 1873, and as the speaker urged again that if women would only go forth into the saloons and pray, they could abolish them, the women who listened to him were moved to carry out his plan.

They gathered in the church to pray, and then bravely marched out two by two and sought the grog shops. They pleaded with

[1] Dr. Dio Lewis of Boston, gave the temperance address. The women who were the first leaders of the movement were Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson of Hillsboro, known for many years as "Mother Thompson"; Mrs. George Carpenter of Washington Court House, and "Mother Stewart" of Springfield, Ohio.

the men they found there to give up liquor, begged the men who sold it to forsake their business, and asked all to accept Christ. In twenty-four hours the Crusade had spread to neighboring towns. Quiet, timid, lady-like women went out into the streets to pray, then boldly went into the saloons to plead with men, and in less than three score days this "whirlwind of the Lord had swept the liquor traffic from two hundred and fifty villages."

The "whirlwind" gathered in strength and intensity, and sheltered and conservative women, meek homekeepers, were carried along with it as it swept on its resistless way. Churches were crowded with enthusiasts and penitents, for at last it seemed as if the day of deliverance were near at hand. If praying would but deliver them, it was easy to pray, and for a time it seemed as if that were indeed the solution of the curse of drink.

As time wore on, however, it was seen that one by one the saloons began to open their doors again and flourish, although prayers were still offered for their annihilation.

The "whirlwind" slowly spent itself, yet those who had been shaken by its strength felt that something must come out of this, that surely such a manifestation was not to be in vain, that the holy fire of enthusiasm had not been miraculously kindled only to leave dead ashes in its wake.

It was as president of the Chicago Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at nothing a year, that Frances Willard began her life work, after refusing an offer of twenty-four hundred dollars a year, to teach in a school for girls. She felt that the "Lord would provide"; but after some months of needless sacrifice she broke down, and by her mother's help was led to see that the Lord does not provide by miracle, for the world is after all upon a strictly economic and commercial basis, and that "the laborer is still worthy of his hire." [1]

It was as a teacher, however, that Frances

[1] When Miss Willard's plight became known, Mrs. Matilda B. Carse, an active leader in the Chicago Union, succeeded in raising one hundred dollars a month for Miss Willard's salary.

Willard achieved her greatest success. She had been a teacher of girls, and now became a teacher of women, who are but grown-up girls. She was a born organizer, and seemed to know intuitively how to appeal to all classes of people, how to set them to work, and how to put the right persons together. She was an ardent believer in the principle of democracy — self-government — and in her work of organizing, strictly applied that fundamental principle.

The Temperance Crusade had indeed been as a mighty wind that shook the country to its foundations. Before the year was over, a National Woman's Temperance Convention was called, "its object to preserve the fruits of the Crusade victory"; in reality it was, as has been said, the "sober second-thought of that unparalleled uprising." The result was the formation of the National W. C. T. U., and the new recruit, Frances Willard, was the second officer in power, the corresponding secretary. In a few years she was elected national president, and as such she remained until her death.

Not to go into the details of her life, it

was in 1876 that, according to her own testimony, she saw as in a vision [1] the ultimate solution of the liquor problem, and a complete line of argument and illustration flashed through her mind; but her fellow-workers were not yet ready to follow where she led. According to her followers, she put the women to school; she trained them, or rather had them train themselves in parliamentary law, in public speaking, in organization, and many other things.

Before the tenth anniversary of the great Crusade rolled around, December, 1883, she had visited every State and Territory in the Union, and left an organized W. C. T. U. for the State behind her. She had spoken in one thousand towns and cities, visiting every town of ten thousand inhabitants and many having but five thousand.

The States and Territories were organized on political lines with State, county, district, and local officers in charge, elected by their own followers, not appointed by the national organization. Miss Willard was a firm be-

[1] Glimpses of Fifty Years. Frances E. Willard, p. 351.

liever in self-government, and perhaps here was one secret of her power. She neither sought nor craved control. Her followers were free. As for herself, she had become a bird of passage. She was a leader and an organizer, and was well content.

As teacher of women she sent them out to gather up petitions, for she believed that there is no method quite so educational as getting signatures to a petition. In Illinois, where much of this educational work was done, in nine weeks the women had gathered in one hundred and eighty thousand names to their Home Protection Petition, and presented it to the Legislature of that State. It was part of her plan to urge the women to go before the Legislature and plead, in order that they might thus realize how futile the method is. She served two purposes thus. Every one who signed the petition became a convert to their cause, and every woman who presented a petition became unconsciously a convert to another doctrine.

She appealed to women on religious and domestic grounds. Timid, conservative women who would have been afraid of any

other reform, were caught by the new Crusade, the "Home Protection" movement. By her teacher's art, she brought them slowly out and made them strong and brave. Few women there are who cannot be appealed to on the liquor question. For the sake of their homes they were willing to fight, but how? with what?

If you will fight you must have weapons. She believed in prayer, and she let them pray, though it was not long before she made them realize that something more is needed besides prayer to fight the liquor monster, but the women were shy and fearful.

Meanwhile, she herself was growing. She had started to fight for temperance, to enlist women in the cause, and to save men. Gradually she saw that intemperance is but one of many allied evils, and one by one she took up the various social problems. She was learning humanity; and as she learned, she drew new converts to her standard.

Time after time she had tried to lead her followers to the goal she saw ahead, but it

was not until 1888 that she achieved her wish in full. There was an International Council of Women called to Washington. They were having a hearing before the Congressional Committee at the Capitol, when Susan B. Anthony said:

"Gentlemen of the Committee: Here stands before you one who is the commander-in-chief of an army of two hundred and fifty thousand women. It is said that women do not want to vote, but this woman has led this vast army to the ballot box, or a wish to get there. I present to you Miss Frances E. Willard." [1]

This was the ultimate goal to which she had led them through the many years. It was in 1876 that she had her vision, and ever since that time she had been giving object lessons in the subject; and after a long and arduous course, after many a rebuff, her army was committed to the cause of suffrage. She taught them that the Ballot is more potent than the Bible when dealing with politics. It is said that no other movement has ever contributed so large a lump sum

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. IV, p. 141.

of adherents into the suffrage camp as the temperance movement under Frances Willard, and that she led them there by a process of educational evolution. It was inevitable.

Not only did she patiently train women into the principles of citizenship, but her ranks proved a training-school for suffrage leaders. How naturally, too, it was all done. She established departments and let those in charge work out their own salvation. Did a woman come with a new idea, she was patiently heard, and usually her mission, as the leader said, "became a *com*mission," and a new department was added to the number already in hand, a new convert and an ardent enthusiast was baptized into the work. In this way was secured that rarest of miracles in any cause — perennial enthusiasm.

Step by step she went on, always seeing the goal ahead, but patiently fitting her stride to that of her followers. She transferred the Crusade from the saloon to the sources whence the saloon derives its power, its guarantee, and its safeguards. She urged the women first to plead for the right

to protect their homes, a Home Protection Ballot, to be allowed to vote only upon the liquor question. In this way she disarmed the women of their own deep prejudice against going into politics, and it found its expression in the great Home Protection Petition.

Even though she went so carefully and so slowly, so deep was the prejudice especially in the South, against women doing public work, that when she had committed the National society to suffrage, it was only her personality that saved the organization from disruption.

With all their varied activities, their practical educational schemes, they never lost the crusade spirit, nor the picturesqueness of their movement. They had their rallying cries or mottoes that won them friends and made them brave—"For God and Home and Native Land"; "A White Life for Two"; "The Home Protection Ballot"; "Gospel Politics"; and many others. Their programme was attractive, so much to do, so much to teach, so many avenues in which to work. They were Woman Crusaders, the

White Ribbon Army, with the White Rose, the White Shield, and the White Cross as emblems.

Beginning on a single reform, they found themselves erelong working for humanity, and working scientifically with educational methods. They commenced with the broken wreck of a man; a dozen years later they opened their hearts to his companion, even deeper steeped in shame — the broken wreck of a woman; and they ended by teaching prevention, by educating the child aright.

They made it possible for the child in school to learn scientifically, as a matter of common and necessary knowledge, the effect of spirituous liquors and the cigarette on the human body. They now advocate the teaching of morals and social hygiene in the same scientific manner. In fact, they arrived at scientific reform by educational methods, instead of emotional regeneration. A perfected Humanity was their object — the ballot to be their weapon of defence, their tool in matters political.

This, then, is what came of the "Whirl-

wind of the Lord." Who shall say that it was not divinely sent?

The material of this chapter was gathered mainly from Miss Willard's own book, "Glimpses of Fifty Years," and from personal information supplied by Miss Helen Hood of the Illinois W. C. T. U., 1114 The Temple, Chicago.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MOVEMENT FINDS CHAMPIONS IN THE SENATE

I APPEAL to the Senators not to decide this question upon the arguments which have been offered here to-day for or against the merits of the proposition. I appeal to them to decide it upon that other principle to which I have adverted,— whether one-half of the American people shall be permitted to go into the arena of public discussion in the various States, and before their Legislatures be heard upon the issue, 'Shall the Federal Constitution be so amended as to extend this right of suffrage?' If, with this opportunity, those who believe in woman suffrage shall fail, then they must be content; for I agree with the Senators upon the opposite side of the chamber and with all who hold that if the suffrage is to be extended at all, it must be by the operation of existing law. I believe it to be an innate right; yet even an innate right must be exercised only

by consent of the controlling forces of the State. That is all woman asks — that an amendment be submitted."

This was the closing appeal of Senator Blair of New Hampshire, in favor of submitting to the several Legislatures a Sixteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution that should guard the rights of woman even as the Fifteenth Amendment guarded those of the colored man. Senator Blair was pleading on the floor of the Senate for millions of his countrywomen, even as Sumner had pleaded many years before in the same place for the million black men of the South. It was the year 1887, and Senator Blair had offered his speech as an argument while presenting a petition for woman suffrage from the W. C. T. U., signed by Frances Willard, president, and the entire official board, representing some two hundred thousand women. In the debate that followed, the usual arguments and time-worn objections were offered, although this time the subject was not treated with the derision and levity of former years.

The chief objector, after a doleful speech, brought forth three documents: one, a list of two hundred men from Massachusetts, including forty-seven clergymen; another, a letter from a woman office-holder; and the third, a pamphlet written by a woman,— all protesting against giving suffrage to women. He claimed that women are emotional, that they are not strong enough, that politics would unfit them for their high office as queens in the home, and more to the same effect!

To this Senator Hoar of Massachusetts objected, saying that the gentleman had refuted his own arguments, himself in his own speech supplying the gush and emotion; but that when he wanted an argument he had to call on a woman to furnish it, for the Senator had taken his arguments from the letter and the pamphlet supplied by women.

To offset the three lonely documents of his opponent on the floor, Senator Blair had presented letters from many distinguished women, and the official petition of two hundred thousand women, while in the vaults of

the Capitol were thousands upon thousands of petitions of former years from American women craving the boon of citizenship.

The debate went on. One Senator, fearful of what would happen should women be allowed to vote, drew a heart-rending picture of the nursing babe, left uncared for in the lonely home while the mother was shut up in a jury room all night; when happily he was reminded that a nursing mother might possibly be exempt from this duty, even as many a man is, upon giving a reasonable, or even a trivial excuse.

The timid were still fearful, and dismal prophecies were made of what would happen should the electorate be further debased by the addition of such vast numbers of illiterate persons; of how the family would be demoralized should husband and wife not agree and finally, that the vote would only be doubled.

Said Senator Dolph of Oregon: "I desire to inform my friend . . . that since women were enfranchised in Washington Territory [1] nature has continued in her

[1] See chapter on Washington State for account of

wonted course. The sun rises and sets; there are seedtime and harvest; seasons come and go;" and so the debate went on, some men liberal, some prejudiced, some indifferent.

It was the first time that the subject of an amendment for women had ever really been discussed in Congress, though for nearly twenty years the women had been coming yearly to the Capitol, bringing with them their thousands of petitions. Time and again they had had hearings, perhaps averaging one a year throughout that time, but only in the presence of a Congressional Committee — usually the Judiciary — the gentlemen listening to them courteously but perfunctorily.

Once they had begged for a special committee, a committee whose sole business it should be to hear appeals from women, listen to their grievances, receive their petitions and, if possible, redress their wrongs. This was in 1881. Not until the following year was their request granted, and then not

how women were disfranchised. History of Woman Suffrage, Vol. III.

without ridicule and derision on the part of many who seemed to see something absurd and laughable in making provision for the well-being of some twenty-five million disfranchised persons.

With a committee of their own, for the first time in all those years of agitation did they feel that they had had a real hearing and for the first time did they get a favorable majority report. It resulted, in 1883, in a Joint Resolution by the Senate and the House proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding that the right of citizens to vote be denied on account of sex.[1]

Too late they discovered that they had been tricked into endorsing a "special committee" instead of insisting upon a permanent one. It was Senator Conkling of New York, an opponent, who by an apparently earnest and interested argument, paved the way for a "Select Committee" for the women; then it was discovered that such committees are voted upon at the beginning of each session and can easily be voted out of

[1] History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. IV, pp. 35–6.

existence, while permanent committees cannot. Needless to say their "Select Committee on Woman Suffrage" was soon disposed of, and once more they had to take chances on getting whom they could to listen to them. To this day there are committees and committee rooms for many purposes, but no provision is yet made at the National Capitol for the especial needs and wants of one-half the people, not even one tiny room can be spared for the womanhood of this great land!

It would indeed have been strange if in all those years of agitation some able champion of the cause had not arisen in the Congressional halls to ask for a consideration of woman's right to the franchise, and a most serious reflection upon the other sex had there not been. A few such men there were. In 1868 Senator Pomeroy of Kansas and Mr. George Julian of Indiana introduced measures providing for universal suffrage, but both were rejected without debate. In 1871–72 there was the splendid minority report of Loughridge and Butler in the House in answer to the Woodhull Memorial; but the

subject is said to have languished until Miss Anthony got into the habit of spending her winters at the capital and acting as lobbyist, yet even with all her labor the list is painfully short.

Considering the amount of eloquence, logic, facts, and historical arguments wasted upon the national body, the shortness of the list of champions is not so derogatory to the great cause of justice, as an admission of stupidity, of ignorant prejudice, on the part of the men concerned. There scarcely averages one champion a year for the many years that the women have been pleading at the Capitol for justice to their sex.

Were there to be made a list of those who had heaped ridicule and sarcasm, those who listened silently, and those who openly and violently opposed it, the list would be tremendous and scarcely to the credit of men. One petition of ten thousand names was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as a joke; when they asked for a special committee it was facetiously suggested to give them the Committee on Revolutionary Claims!

Many a man who was convinced of the absolute justice of the women's claims opposed it on the grounds of inexpediency, and many opposed it because of violent prejudice. Indeed one can almost measure the status of a man's intellectuality, the extent of his education, the scope of his reasoning powers, by his attitude on the woman question; but the same is also true of all questions involving toleration and equality of rights, whether in religion, industry, or matters pertaining to racial differences.

The result upon the floor of the Senate, you ask? What did you expect? Sixteen yeas, thirty-four nays, and twenty-six absent. Following is the proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which has not yet been passed:

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied nor abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce this provision.

As for the woman champions of equality, during the years from 1875 to 1877 they sent thousands of petitions to Congress for a Sixteenth Amendment, knowing that there was no longer hope for them under the Constitution as it stood, while many women sent personal memorials to Congress asking for enfranchisement, even as men do in special cases, though the latter seldom ask in vain. Matilda Joslyn Gage, author of "Woman, Church, and State," was the first to send such a memorial.

With remarkable fidelity they planned and held their many conventions, in the East, in the West, or where they could. In 1876, the nation's great centennial anniversary, they wisely refused longer to consider the historic Declaration of Independence enough for them, but wrote and read one of their own. Some thought the proceeding foolish, sensational; some, wise and proper; others, perhaps, ridiculous; but no doubt posterity will justify their course and applaud their spirit. Too long has woman played the submissive part in life, and allowed her claims to be ignored.

In 1878 they held the thirtieth anniversary of their movement. It was the last meeting Lucretia Mott ever attended; and as she left the pulpit and passed down the aisle of the church where they had met three decades before, the audience arose instinctively with bowed heads, and one cried out, "Good-bye, dear Lucretia!" Thus she passed out from their sight, soon to enter the life beyond.

It is one of the beautiful things of this woman movement that woman is emancipated from the fear of old age. She who enters into the larger life need no longer scan her mirror with fear and apprehension for signs of approaching age, which were once the death knell of her ambitions and her hope; she can face life bravely knowing that in the ranks of a holy cause, in real humanity, there is room for all and love and honor for the aged, if they will but earn it.

The most notable occurrence for many years happened in 1879, when Belva A. Lockwood scored a brilliant victory. She had been denied the right to practise before the Supreme Court, because she was a woman. It was through her persistent appeals, that

Belva A. Lockwood

a law was passed by an overwhelming majority in both houses of Congress and signed by President Hayes, to prohibit the Supreme Court from denying admission to lawyers on account of sex. She spent five years in securing this important result. The following year, on motion from her, the first colored man was admitted to practise in the Supreme Court; so that to this woman belongs the honor of securing equal privileges for lawyers irrespective of color, race, or sex. It has been described as a most impressive scene, when the first woman to be admitted there presented a black man, asking for him equal rights with herself. Truly, as has been said, it was "a fitting subject for an historical painting." [1]

Women did not rest content with appealing to Legislatures, courts, and Congressional Committees. They tried to get into politics. In 1868 they began sending delegates to every presidential convention but, except for the tiny splinter that once got

[1] See History of Woman Suffrage. Vol. III, pp. 108, 138, 174.

into the Republican platform, and some recognition by the Prohibition party, they gained but little. It was also one of Frances Willard's dreams that much could be accomplished through political parties, but at last she, too, was forced to abandon such hopes. Not even the Prohibition party was progressive enough to stand by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, showing how deep-rooted is the prejudice against a disfranchised class, especially if composed of women.

Surely we women will have small reason ever to be thankful to politicians, statesmen, judges, legislators, or presidents, or to men, no matter what they may in the future do for us. They have robbed us of all, and are slow in making restitution. One is scarcely bound to be thankful to a highway robber who gives back piecemeal his unlawful loot.

It will cost us hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars, much personal sacrifice, and untold hours of labor, toil, and weariness, to get back what has been taken from us. Truly the men of America fall

far short of chivalry, justice, and honor, in this one matter, at least. Strange it is that no one of them has arisen in deepest penitence to demand that his fellows erase this foulest blot from the escutcheon of American manhood, for if woman is degraded by her disfranchisement, surely man is infinitely more disgraced by his passive participation in the wholesale crime!

CHAPTER XV

ONE REASON WHY THE MOVEMENT LANGUISHED

BELCHING great clouds of smoke and steam, with many a snort and puff, a railroad train with human freight was speeding on its westward way, leaving behind a trail of dust and smoke and cinders. It spied the homely outfit of a home-seeker slowly plodding with his wife and child, toward the land of promise, the land of the setting sun. It passed them in a roar of sound, blowing great clouds of smoke and dust into their faces as if to show its great contempt for them, and then was gone.

The man flicked his ox-goad as the train rushed by, as though to hurry the weary, patient beasts; the faded, unkempt woman sighed; the child peeped out with wondering eyes; the gentle oxen plodded on unheeding;

the little herd trailing behind made answering calls to the shrieking thing that passed.

Then slowly the melancholy outfit rattled on into the deepening twilight, the canvas-covered wagon weighted down with pots and kettles and household goods, the weary occupants a picture of hopeless sordidness, the last pathetic stragglers of a vast army of home-seekers that had long since forged ahead of them in wagons such as theirs. So it was that with a new race of adventurers aboard, the thing of steam and steel had passed them by triumphantly, eating up in one short hour the miles that might cost them a week of time. Then they, too, the stragglers, faded into the distance and were swallowed up in the mystery beyond.

On rushed the train into the night, a great black serpent with glistening scales; a monstrous, one-eyed glowworm; a snorting comet, wreathed in rosy, fleecy clouds, dragging behind a tail of fiery sparks. It spied a tiny cabin-light upon the endless plains, and screamed aloud a friendly call; for here were friends and partners; it roared and rumbled and whistled shrilly, then bored its

way into the great black hole that lay beyond, and was swallowed up into the night.

The cabin man relaxed a little as the roaring thing sped by, for in the sound he knew that progress and prosperity were very near; the cabin woman sighed — did her weary body and starved soul rebel sometimes at the hardness of her lot? — the cabin child peeped out of the window, wide-eyed and wondering. They were lonely and alone. The thing had passed them by, but the thing it represented had caught up with them and not long would they be lonely or alone.

As for the plodding prairie-schooner with its trail of dust, its weary travellers, with faces toward the West, who shall say it was a sordid sight? Rather was not this group — the man in blue jeans and great straw hat; the gaunt, tired woman in her faded calico and flapping bonnet, her face so bronzed and careworn, her ugly hands so red and hard, her whole form a travesty of feminine grace; the grimy child, travel-soiled and weary — was not this melancholy group heroic, grand, sublime, a fit subject for the sculptor's art? For surely they were the last pathetic rem-

nants, the belated recruits and rear guard of that sturdy race of heroes and heroines who together have subdued the continent! They are the true Americans, the pioneers, courageous, strong, and brave. Their faces are set toward the lonely cabin-light upon the endless plains; or they seek a home upon the mountain-side or in its valley; for their faith is large, or their need is great!

A race of heroes and heroines indeed! The imagination fails to grasp the bravery of those early men and women, the first brave pioneers. First, they came across the seas to an unfriendly land; then with their little ones and their few sticks of furniture, their household gods, they struck into the forest depths to find a home. To find a home? No! to clear a space, to build a hut, a cabin, then guard it, fight for it, slave for it, suffer for it. At any moment a foe might come, with terrible results.

Truly the American woman was born for greater things than serfdom and subjection, for her heritage of courage, her endurance, and her resourcefulness in meeting danger

are queenly, even as man's is kingly; but he has gained his sovereignty, having proclaimed that he has earned it by the prowess of his arm. Yet the blood turns cold, the flesh creeps, at the bare recital of the scenes of blood and horror through which those early women lived and toiled and suffered for a home and liberty, and through it all trusted in the Power Above, and loved the country for which they toiled. They lived through experiences which to-day would unseat the reason of their sons and daughters. They saw their children murdered or carried into captivity, their babies brained against the trees, and did not rebel. They faced the tomahawk, the scalping knife, the stake, captivity; they met the wild beast, the serpent, without flinching.

The children born in those solitudes were bold and free. Courage and bravery knew no sex or age, for all were brave alike, men, women, and little children. They loved the quiet depths; they wanted space in which to breathe, and they struck into some deeper forest in which to find a home and space, once

again to defy the savage, the wild beast, and the elements.

In time the forest solitudes were cleared, and towns and cities grew up, with farms around. The frontier receded, and the pioneer in search of home and space emerged upon the plains and prairies of the Middle West. With him went the woman and the child, their little all in the crude wagon drawn by patient beasts. The plains were conquered, even as the forests were, and given to the State.

Westward, ever westward, the stream of life crept on, the relentless savage protesting at every step of the way. Then came the locomotive, and at last the red man was pushed back, subdued and broken, for he could not cope with the great new monster that rushed and roared across the plains, bringing with it load after load of human freight, and scattering it broadcast over valley and plain, to reclaim the land and fight to the death for supremacy.

America has been the theatre of moving peoples, a scene of vast migration, in which

men and women have taken part. Surely the State owes no more to the one than to the other, for together they have subdued the land and freely given it unto the State.

CHAPTER XVI

THE AWAKENING

UP to the time of the present younger generation, women quite naturally had their limitations, especially as regards book knowledge and general culture. Their lives were spent mainly for the sake of others. They did not even live unto themselves but were taught, not to be good women, but good daughters, good wives, good mothers, good housekeepers, good neighbors. They were busy with the things of life, too busy to think of rights or wrongs; besides, what were men for, if not to see to it that women were protected? — this from the generality of women. If they suffered, it was the Lord's will.

Naturally, the woman's rights movement did not appeal to many of them, and those who needed it did not know of it, or perhaps did not dare to avail themselves of it; nor

did the temperance movement call them all. In 1868, however, a new idea was bravely launched, the end of which none could have foreseen. A club for women was established in New York and one in Boston, for the sole purpose of the self-culture and pleasure of their members! Such a thing was unheard of before. That women should actually band themselves together for their own benefit was preposterous! Women were created for — their duty was —. Small wonder that the innovation brought on a storm of protest, but somehow the idea spread.

Self-improvement for women — why not, if coupled with agreeable companionship? Study clubs sprang up all over the country, no place seemingly too insignificant to escape the contagion, while every city aspired to have a real Woman's Club, which, before long, became a miniature college, with its various departmental activities. In time women learned to organize, and gathered their big city clubs into State federations, and the States into a national association, the better to further their plans. The General Federation of Women's Clubs was organized

in 1890. Ten years later it boasted a membership of two hundred thousand women.

As for the smaller, independent clubs, there were Browning clubs, Shakespeare clubs, clubs for art, literature, travel, clubs for all kinds of culture, including polite culture. Women wrote papers and read them in a panic of fear, for most of them were afraid of the sound of their own voices in this new field, though they were brave enough in other ways. Gradually, however, they grew more courageous in these things and learned the ways of the world. They gained culture and began to see the need of a higher education for their daughters.

Then some grew weary of Browning, Shakespeare, and art, and turned their attention to more practical things. They wanted to better conditions, to aid the children, to further the interests of the home, to clean and beautify the streets and towns; for after all they were women, and women cannot long be selfish in the mass.

In short, they entered civics before they were aware, for the things they wanted to do are done by law and legal procedure, and

having entered into those sacred precincts they learned once more their limitations. They were indeed people; they were living in the State, for the State; they were counted in the population; they were taxed; but — they had no power! What they wanted did not count, for they found that they were outside of the real things, they were helpless. Why? Because their names were not on the polling lists of the wards in which they lived. It was as if they did not even exist! No man was so humble but that he would count, his wishes at least considered; but no woman was big enough to force her way that she also might count one!

Powerless! Of no account! They who had helped to build the State itself, who by their labor had helped to reclaim the land from savagery? How came it so? Surely it could not be?

Yet, while they had been busy with the things of life, busy in the home, being good wives, good mothers, good sisters, good daughters, their natural protectors had built up the working machinery of the State, and carefully excluded them from all power,

though not in the least from any responsibility, the women who had so courageously borne with them the dangers and burden of the fray. The men, in their egoism, forgot that every wagon had its woman; every lonely hut and cabin its courageous mistress.

Not even with this shock did every woman awaken to the situation. Long centuries of submission, of false and contradictory reasoning, have unfitted most women for clear, straightforward thinking, and many sons inherit their mothers' limitations. The women counted much upon that mystic and intangible thing called "influence"; but of what avail is influence when weighed in the balance with a "constituency," which is usually the only restraining power known to city councils and State legislatures?

After a few lessons in practical civics is it any wonder that many women became converted to the philosophy of Susan B. Anthony? Is it any wonder either, that victims of roundabout methods of reasoning should be so slowly converted, or that, lacking practical lessons, they should be content with their lot? Yet one by one, in groups and in

companies, they come straggling at last into the camp of the women who are fighting for civil rights, for recognition by the State.

The club idea spread seemingly into every department of life, and there are scores of religious, missionary, patriotic, industrial, and social organizations made up of women, which are working for the betterment, not only of themselves, but of society itself. Thus apart from the woman's club proper, the departmental club, thousands of women, organized and unorganized, are being trained almost imperceptibly into civic life and ideals.

The club idea even invaded the suffrage camp; had it not, the suffrage movement must have died; for the fact remains that the club movement swamped the woman's rights movement for years. Suffrage, pure and undefiled, as the early mothers taught it, involving misunderstanding, ridicule, ostracism, was scarcely inviting to women at large. Besides, it was a hopeless cause and required far too much intellectual work for many women to follow it during those long years of constitutional and legal struggles. There are fashions in women even as in other things.

The strong women of *ante bellum* days demanding rights were followed by polite ladies of *post bellum* days seeking culture. The gentle club women frowned for years upon the strenuous agitators, and it is said that in towns where once the cause flourished most through the exertions of strong women, where once woman's rights were rampant, it is now most difficult to arouse enthusiasm on the subject. Such is the situation which so puzzles onlookers. But after all it is easy of solution.

If the temperance movement was a "whirlwind of the Lord," surely the club movement might be likened to the quiet overflow of some great stream upon a parched and thirsty land, leaving it rich and fertile, ready for the sowing of the new springtime. The club movement was surely the "Lord's inundation," a mighty preparation for something great and wonderful.

The suffrage movement called in trumpet tones, defiantly, and only the brave and rebellious dared answer. The temperance movement called in dulcet tones and spoke

devotion, and many, forgetting self, answered the call. The club movement entered into the heart of the community, entered into the home, and whispered gently to the woman there; and waiting, she answered. It asked no favors, required no bond, no confession of faith. Strangely enough, the temperance movement and the club movement, both at first so far removed and holding themselves aloof, have moved on and capitulated before the camp of the suffragists, pitched boldly before the legislative halls. They laid siege to the citadel of citizenship long since, and the siege is not yet raised. So far but five citadels have capitulated — Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, and Washington, though valiant recruits are coming in from every side to swell the besieging armies..

CHAPTER XVII

COUNTING THE GAINS

UPON the stage of the Columbia Theatre in Washington, D. C., during the week beginning February 13, 1898, there stood an old-fashioned, round, mahogany table, draped with the Stars and Stripes and over it another flag of silk with four golden stars in one corner. The little old table was the centre of attraction, for it had become historic.

The theatre was crowded. There were present delegates from all but four States and Territories of the Union. The occasion was an auspicious one, and there was a reason for making that little mahogany table the target for all eyes; for on it had been written a full half century before, a Declaration of the Rights of Women! Four women, now immortal, had gathered round that table,

— Lucretia Mott, Mary Ann McClintock, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Martha C. Wright. They sat and formulated a list of the grievances of women, and issued a call to a convention to consider those grievances; but then, though filled with righteous indignation, they dared not sign their names to it, but published it anonymously.

Small wonder that the table was now a treasured relic, that it had been reverently brought to pose as the chief ornament of a gala occasion; for women, both white and colored, had gathered from all parts of the country and some from across the seas, to celebrate the fact that their great movement was now half a century old. Beginning in ridicule and opprobrium, its instigators had lived to see it become a world movement, its advocates honored and loved by thousands of people. They had met, therefore, to count their gains and found that practically all their demands had been acknowledged as just, and that four States in the Union had granted to their women the right of full suffrage; hence the silk flag with the four golden stars.

Wyoming, while still a Territory, had

granted full suffrage to its women in 1869. Just one year later the women of Utah were enfranchised by the Territorial Legislature, but in 1887 the right was arbitrarily and unjustly wrested from them by a Congressional Act. Political equality was restored in 1895 by the adoption of a new Constitution which contained that provision. Colorado women were enfranchised in 1893 and those of Idaho in 1896, both by means of Constitutional Amendments submitted to the voters of those States.[1]

There were lesser triumphs. Kansas gave the municipal suffrage in 1887, and Louisiana bestowed upon them a tax-paying franchise in 1898. Several other States had conferred a limited suffrage upon women, but the vast majority of women of the United States were still classified by the Government with the criminals, idiots, insane, and incompetents of society.

Truly they had ploughed virgin fields, filled with many a stump and bowlder of prejudice. They had advocated many re-

[1] Washington women gained equality for the second time in 1910.

forms, and after the most stubborn resistance, they had cleared the way for better conditions for women.

What were their gains? — it might be well to ask. Many of the unjust laws discriminating against women had been repealed, or better ones framed to take their places; their sex was represented in nearly every profession and industry and in many trades. Schools and colleges were now open to them. They were allowed to speak in public, and many of the prejudices of former years were slowly disappearing, owing to their revolt and to a wider diffusion of education and more liberal ideas.

As for women and the law, when the woman's rights movement began, fifty years before, a man might sue and recover damages from any one tender-hearted enough to shelter his runaway wife. No matter how he might abuse her, a wife had no legal right to leave her husband, and no one had the legal right to shelter her. Was it any wonder that those rebellious ones had passionately protested that the status of the woman was practically that of the slave?

In the eyes of the law the wife had no rights except that of a bare existence. She had precisely the rights of a slave. She could claim shelter, food, and clothing in return for her labor and service, and the husband could not kill her without violating the law. Her property (even if earned or inherited before marriage), her children, her wages (if she earned any), her labor, everything she had, belonged absolutely to her husband. In return he promised,— "With all my worldly goods I thee endow,"— a promise the law never compelled him to keep, and which he seldom attempted to carry out. However, it is a foolish promise and should be broken; for on entering into a partnership no one should ask for more than equal rights, and a just division for each alike.

In some States a woman could not legally sign a will, nor, under the Common Law, could a married woman hold property in her own name.

Crimes against little girls could not be redressed in many cases because the "age of consent" was so low [1] as to make it almost

[1] After years of agitation it is still far too low.

impossible to convict the culprit. Under the Common Law it was usually ten years, and in one State [1] it had been so low as seven! In most of the States of the Union, to-day, a girl's property is better safeguarded by law than her person, and the civil code still discriminates against the sex of Eve.

Had not romance flung its rosy hue over the marriage tie, had not love softened the harshness of the law, had not many a man risen superior to his legal rights, and had not religion always counselled the submission of the woman as the erring one or the one who should forgive, her condition would long ago have become intolerable, and in desperation she would have striven to avenge her wrongs. Yet the first leaders of the woman movement for equal rights had seen the status of their sex rise from its degradation ever higher and higher, and almost year by year.

It is significant that in Wyoming, the pioneer equal rights State, the age is twenty-one years.

[1] Delaware reduced the age from ten to seven years in 1871. In 1889 it was raised to fifteen, and made it a misdemeanor. For brief data on "legal age of consent" in various States, see "A Short History of Woman's Rights," by Hecker.

They saw the revolution that ended in educational liberty; and they saw the battle begun for industrial and economic freedom, though this will never be fully gained until men and women together strive to reach that goal. They saw laws enacted to bring further freedom to their sex; but in it all and through it all they still insistently demanded political freedom; they sought the ballot as the supreme right by which all other rights and liberties are to be secured and held in safety.

Their movement, however, had become world-wide, had spread to other lands, had thrived and borne good fruit for other women. In less than fifty years the women of every large English-speaking city *outside of the United States of America*, had been granted the municipal franchise; while in New Zealand, South Australia, and West Australia they had been given the same rights absolutely that men enjoyed. The American women, with whom the great movement had originated, had the doubtful satisfaction, therefore, of knowing that in most foreign countries a limited suffrage had been given;

that in Sweden, Norway, and Finland great strides had been made; and that women apparently were more highly regarded abroad by monarchical governments than in their own country under the flag of freedom.

The reason for this lies in the fact that we have a written Constitution which is almost impossible to change. Added to this, every State has a written Constitution patterned after the national one and equally hard to amend. Instead, therefore, of a flexible instrument responding to our needs, we have an almost immovable impediment standing directly in the path of progress. Ours is the only country where the elected representative body may not of itself extend the elective franchise at its own discretion. Here in the United States not only must the legislative body approve of such a measure, but the majority of the existing electorate must give it sanction.

Taken all in all, however, so many triumphs had been won, the lot of women had been so much softened, their way made so much easier, that it was difficult to arouse

the younger women to the real degradation involved in disfranchisement, or to awaken them to the fact that there were yet many wrongs to be righted, much still to be accomplished.

CHAPTER XVIII

INTO THE NEW CENTURY

WITH the coming of the new century the conduct of affairs fell into younger hands, as one by one the pioneers passed into the great beyond, honored, loved, and mourned. Yet the movement to a great extent had become stationary, for it must be confessed that, in spite of the tremendous gains for women in general, woman suffrage, as a practical proposition, languished from the time it became a Constitutional question. When it passed from the realm of sentiment to the dry and musty atmosphere of the courts, many women must have become discouraged with the apparently utter hopelessness of their cause. It is to the credit of the faithful ones that through all those trying years they never lost sight of the goal, nor faltered in their high resolve.

True, there was an increasing liberality of thought, a growing belief in equal rights from an academic standpoint, but the sentiment was scattered, difficult to crystallize. The subject was considered more or less an abstract one, usually provoking a smile, for now women are apparently a favored class and far from needing or wishing for more protection than they have.

As for the growth of sentiment, various labor unions had gone on record in favor of giving women the right to vote, as had the National Grange; while four Western States had won absolute political equality. The indefatigable labors of lecturers on the subject had kept up some interest, but not enough. Practically, it was a dead subject. What with Congress, Legislatures, courts, Constitutions, the moneyed interests, all hostile to it, and what with wave after wave of immigrants breaking over us, shortly to be absorbed and given a voice against equality, it was an almost hopeless task to bring it to an issue, like sweeping up the ocean with a broom. With a sublime devotion, however, the faithful kept at their posts, distributing

literature, working with legislatures, trying to build up suffrage clubs, to interest new people; but there was little enthusiasm, and but little publicity. Could it be that there was a conspiracy of silence on the part of the press?

Like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky came the news, late in 1905, of the so-called militant movement in London, led by Emmeline Pankhurst, followed by the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of women, who, apparently, were going to desperate lengths to secure the right to vote. Sensation followed sensation, the stories giving the impression of excitement bordering on hysteria, but the conspiracy of silence was broken, and the whole world heard.

Women were aroused, some to enthusiasm, some to disgust, some to curiosity, some to simple wonderment. Men smiled or shrugged their shoulders or scoffed, but woman suffrage news was in demand, and woman suffrage, woman's rights, became once more a living question. Emmeline Pankhurst proved

herself a great leader. Her followers courted danger, they got themselves arrested, went to prison, wore prison clothes, performed menial labors, ate the coarsest of prison fare, then revolted and tried to starve themselves, and went on a hunger strike. They became martyrs to the cause.

They transferred their question from the parlor and the club to the street, from an academic proposition to a living, vital issue. Their prison dresses became badges of honor, and those who returned from prison were received with great ovations. Mrs. Pankhurst turned her movement into a spectacular crusade, with "Votes for Women" as the slogan of war.

Once more the fires of enthusiasm burned in women's hearts. People asked wonderingly, "What is this right for which gently bred women are willing to be imprisoned, to starve, to risk bodily harm, to endure pain? Are these women heroines, or are they fanatics?" Little by little the story came out, told by the women themselves. They had tried persuasion, tried ladylike methods, tried

waiting, been patient, had for years presented their petitions for full suffrage, and then gone home. Result — nothing.

Again it was a case of individual or class experience, of learning an object-lesson. Emmeline Pankhurst, as a public official, had been stirred to the deepest indignation by the discriminations against her sex. She concluded that the invidious distinctions against women in legal matters were made because of their limited powers, and she set herself to gain full political rights or die in the attempt.

Under her leadership English women studied history to find out how the various classes of men had won their rights, and then adopted the tactics that led their predecessors to victory. Strangely enough, the English Government, so susceptible to arguments made by males, pretends to regard these historic methods as signs of feminine hysteria, while an unprejudiced observer is forced to the conclusion that the only argument a British statesman can understand is a brickbat or a fist. Nevertheless, the militant movement in England has advanced the cause of Equal

Rights to the dignity of a world question. It is now a living issue.

American women were stirred to action by the militant movement in England, and soon the movement here was in full swing again, its activities being for a time focussed in New York City. There two women of wealth became interested, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont and Mrs. Clarence Mackay, both giving of their time and means. As a result of this financial boom in an otherwise humble society, and the social prestige thus given it, the movement was widely exploited by the press, in a highly sensational manner. There was much "feature" press-work, much publicity, though not much solid attainment.

Underneath this spectacular exhibition of power, however, there was worked out quietly a new movement, essentially democratic. It was unheralded by the press and was not financially supported by people of wealth, but it has worked for great ends. This is the woman's party movement [1] as worked out

[1] The woman's party idea is undoubtedly an outgrowth of the methods used in 1896 in the cam-

in New York City, in the year 1910, under the leadership of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt. Being organized from local centres, self-governing, growing from the inside, and evolving from within, it is essentially constructive and tends toward real democracy. This great movement, which has within the year rolled up a membership of thousands by precinct and ward, has been carried on quietly and unostentatiously.[1]

paigns of Idaho and California. Miss Anthony pointed out later that in every county which was properly organized with a committee in every precinct who visited every voter and distributed leaflets in every family, the Amendment received a majority vote. It was her belief that we need expect to carry no State in which are large cities, until we institute the house-to-house canvass to educate the voters and their families.

[1] It is asserted that the Washington victory was won by the party method, though not under the name. It was constructive and educational. The Washington women practically won their own battle. The precincts, wards, and districts were organized, at least in the larger centres, and the women won by concentrated efforts. There was some outside financial help, but the campaign was won because the women of the State were left to their own resources. Furthermore, if the movement for equal rights is to win, to come to its full fruition of civic regenera-

In connection with the party idea is another one, originated by Mrs. Frances Squire Potter. This is what she calls a "political settlement." It originated with her, but has since been expanded and is in the process of evolution. The first political settlement was in Spokane, Washington, Mrs. Potter having outlined the plan for it in a speech there some two years ago. The plan was carried out and had its share in the Washington campaign. Having won citizenship, the women are now organizing Spokane into a chain of political settlements to continue the work for permanent citizenship.

In Baltimore, Md., Mrs. Ellicott introduced the idea with most excellent results. Staten Island is to be organized into a chain of these settlements and also some of the western New York counties, while the plan is already in operation in St. Louis and in some California centres as well. The move-

tion, each community must be allowed to work out its own problems. Leaders must be developed by their own struggles. Each community, and finally each individual, must learn the vital relation of politics to life.

ment is said to be a harmonizing one, something on the order of the departmental woman's club. It gives every one something to do, and offers no especial chance for personal aggrandizement.

Naturally the question is asked: "What is a political settlement?" Briefly, the idea is to secure permanent headquarters in every locality, either in a rented room, or in a store, or in a private home, where members of the community are free to go, to meet each other and study conditions and make plans. These places are to be fitted up with desks, maps, and books, and supplied with political data; they are, in fact, study rooms, to be used also for smaller meetings. In other words, they constitute a democratic workshop, a training school for citizenship, and a place to plan scientific political work.

The political settlement is an evolution from the departmental club and the social settlement. It is founded upon the belief that self-respecting communities, like self-respecting families, desire self-government and self-support, and are capable, as well, of working out their own salvation. It is an edu-

cational scheme for regenerating the community.

A century of experimentation must surely have convinced the most optimistic that even republicanism cannot be successfully superimposed upon a people, and that limited suffrage is scarcely an overwhelming success. If, then, republicanism cannot be superimposed, neither can democracy; for, as the projectors of the political settlement point out, democracy must be lived to be realized.

In its last essence it is local self-government; and the logical home of the political settlement would seem to be the schoolhouse; for if democracy must be lived, self-government (politics, if you please) must be earnestly, devoutly, and humbly studied by each and all. A school for politics? Why not? Then shall we learn to think our own politics, and the boss shall be no more.

Better still, in going to school again, or perhaps in never leaving it, we shall learn to know our neighbors and love them as ourselves; and in knowing our neighbors we shall in time, perhaps, come to know the Great Unknown, whatever that may prove to be.

Thus shall it be proved that politics in a civilized community is life itself; and who shall say that women are unfitted for life, when they themselves carry it on from generation to generation?

CHAPTER XIX

LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE

LOOKING into the coming years, a thousand questions press to the lips, a thousand forebodings clutch at the heart. What will be the outcome of it all? Yet in spite of apprehensions, the feeling grows ever stronger that not only for her own sake, but for the sake of civilization itself, woman must press on to play her part in politics. If she be true to her race, to her country, to her generation, she dare not shirk the issue, for questions are arising so difficult, so complex, so grave, so far-reaching, and so vital to society, that only the combined thought of the whole people, male and female, will be able to settle them satisfactorily.

If, then, from now on women should refuse to do their part, if men should too long

restrain them from their high calling, civilization itself must fail. If one-half the race, the mothers, be continually thwarted, repressed, rebuked, kept in subjection, forbidden any concern in the great problems pressing ever for solution, how can the race do other than go backward into that condition from which it came, or into some darker night?

How can slavish women breed free men, or petty women with narrow view give birth to men of large and wholesome vision?

Women are the creators of the race. They mould and fashion and create the generations yet to come. Woman is the architect of humanity. Bone of her bone, flesh of her flesh, spirit of her spirit, she makes it in her own likeness. If we would have a race of men, strong, bold, and free, a race fit for great achievements, then woman must be fitted for the task. She is the measure of the coming family of man.

Much is said, unfortunately, of what women will accomplish when they enter civic life, but such boasting is neither beautiful

nor wise. The question should be rather one of essential right and justice. Ours was designed to be a representative Government, and men have long since decided for themselves that he who has no voice in the making of the laws under which he lives, is in a condition of slavery; and until women come also to this conception, there will be no considerable advance in real civilization. For after all, women are the ones to decide what women need, and they, too, should elect representatives to present their claims even as their brothers do. They should become conscious members of society, and neither happiness nor unhappiness should cloud their vision with regard to civic duties, civic responsibilities, and civic privileges.

Equal rights, equal responsibilities, are all that they should ask. With high civic ideals, politics will uplift women, make their view of life larger, their sphere bigger and holier. For women should not enter civic life boasting that they will purify politics, but enter humbly, resolving that eventually politics will ennoble both womanhood and manhood, raising both alike to a higher con-

ception of human life and its possibilities, when equal justice reigns.

No doubt, in time we shall all be trained in civic duties from the kindergarten up, quite as naturally as we are now trained to read, write, and conduct ourselves. No distinction will then be made because of a mere accident of birth; for science has not yet decided whether or not there is an essential maleness and femaleness in the germ of life, or whether nutrition or other forces decide the fate of the child within the womb; and surely no one should be held responsible for an accident of birth or deprived of certain rights because of a state of being which can never be remedied nor changed.

To be born a human being should decide our fitness for human rights, and without doubt self-government is the fundamental right of every normal human adult. To stand on an equal footing with one's fellows is as much as any reasonable being will ask. To ask for less shows mental incapacity; to deny less to any fellow-being shows the same deplorable state of ignorance and mental limitation.

Having gained the right to an education, to earn a living as she sees fit, the right to her wages, to her property, to public speech, and to many other privileges previously denied her, woman should press on without ceasing until she gains the right to self-government, the human right to count as one in all the affairs of life, to be a real person in all things, no longer a chattel without will or rights. So shall come to pass gradually that state of which the philosophers dream, that state which is the only logical outcome of any civilization that can justify itself — democracy.

The woman's movement is the logical outcome of the man's movement; it is but another chapter in the struggle for liberty that began in ages long since passed. If the scientists have read aright the drama of the race, its life began with female life. The Mother Age preceded the Father Age; but the man's movement for liberty preceded the woman's. In time the two will merge into the human movement, for human liberty and human rights.

So should we continually impress upon the

younger generations how hardly these rights have been won for us, nor esteem them lightly; for the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and will be until the end.

THE END

Made in Italy